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March 28, 2023

To: Academic Senate Committee and Council Chairs

From: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Committee/Council Status Updates on Promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at the UCLA Academic Senate

At the March 16, 2023, meeting of the Executive Board, members reviewed the recent status updates from Academic Senate committees and councils on efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) within the Academic Senate.

Members expressed appreciation for the responses and on-going efforts. They noted the significant variation in how committees/councils are attending to DEI, both in the subject matter of their agenda items and in the way that Senate bodies operate.

Members approved a motion to suggest that every committee/council incorporate DEI considerations when introducing each item on a meeting agenda. (The Executive Board, for example, includes in the introduction of each agenda item, no matter the topic, a brief [1-2 sentence] consideration of whether and how that agenda item may be related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.) Additionally, the Executive Board recommends assigning a rotating lead among your committee/council membership to present those DEI considerations. Please consider implementing this practice at future meetings. I welcome your feedback on this small meeting facilitation tool.

As the Academic Senate moves into the next phase of aligning our work more closely with our DEI values and commitments, we continue to consider how best to support our committees/councils and members. Please reach out to me and Executive Director April de Stefano if you seek support or to discuss ideas.

At the Executive Board meeting members discussed how it is the responsibility of each committee/council and of every faculty member to serve the Academic Senate in a way that contributes to diversity, equity, and inclusion. This is our collective journey, and thank you for your part in moving us forward.

Cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
Andrea Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
Academic Senate Staff
March 3, 2023

Jessica Cattelino, Chair
Academic Senate

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

Dear Chair Cattelino,

At its meeting on March 1, 2023, the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) reviewed the letter from the Executive Board with suggestions to improve Promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at the UCLA Academic Senate. The following comments were shared:

It is evident and an equity issue that the universities’ research infrastructure, data resources, and services are inequivalent between disciplines, leading to discrepancies, and a lack of resources, knowledge, training, and support for members to sufficiently conduct research.

The committee agreed, in an effort to raise DEI impacts and values during committee discussions, COLASC will continue to keep in mind for every issue discussed the impact DEI concerns may have on the outcome of the issue raised and presented.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact robert.zeithammer@anderson.ucla.edu, or the Committee Analyst, at rrouzankay@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Robert Zeithammer, Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

cc: Andrea Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Charlotte Rose, Committee Analyst, Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
    Renee Rouzan-Kay, Senior Policy Analyst, Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
    Members of the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
February 27, 2023

TO: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, Academic Senate

FR: Andrew Leuchter, Chair, Council on Planning and Budget

RE: UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Plan

At its meeting on February 6, 2023, members of the Council on Planning and Budget reviewed and discussed the August 29, 2022 letter from the Executive Board.

CPB has advocated for faculty participation in key budget decision-making processes. Through its work at the Budget Model Working Group and the newly established Health Sciences Finances Working Group, the Council continues to be mindful of the need to have a diverse group of members to participate in and lead the discussions of key campus issues. Similarly, members were encouraged to consider and propose colleagues for Senate service.

CPB will continue to discuss and advocate for a diversity of opinions in budget decisions.

cc: Andrea Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Elizabeth Feller, Associate Director, Academic Senate
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
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
February 27, 2023

TO: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, Academic Senate

FR: Jeff Brantingham, Chair, Council on Research

RE: UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Plan

At its meeting on February 1, 2023, members of the Council on Research (COR) reviewed and discussed the August 29, 2022 letter from the Executive Board.

Through its research and travel grants program, COR has continuously advocated for support for junior faculty, explicitly stated in its call for proposals, in addition to offering an automatic deadline extension. The review process has a built-in step to benefit junior faculty applications. One of our members is involved in the TDG review, we have established a connection to the ORA/OCGA area and also meet with the ORCA to offer a distinct point of view and perspective.

COR looks forward to continuing the discussion and support of this very important topic.

cc: Andrea Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Elizabeth Feller, Associate Director, Academic Senate
    Members of the Council on Research
Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy

February 27, 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 7, 2023, the Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy (CDITP) reviewed the letter from the Executive Board with suggestions to improve Promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at the UCLA Academic Senate. The following comments were suggested:

CDITP recognizes the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion, particularly as part of the Academic Senate, it is unclear to CDITP how to proceed on this front, particularly given the limited number of meetings that this committee typically has annually; and 2) the relatively small size of the CDITP also limits the committee’s ability to capture both representations in perspectives as well as the required knowledge/expertise for the committee, and so one of the forthcoming recommendations on CDITP’s future will be the increase the size of the committee, which would then assist with DEI and other operational aspects of this group.

Thank you for all your efforts on this report. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at BuiA@mii.ucla.edu or via the Committee analyst, Renee Rouzan-Kay, at rrouzankay@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Alex Bui, Chair
Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy

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 Data, Information Technology, and Privacy
Members of the Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy
February 23, 2023

TO: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Sandra Graham, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Re: UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Plan

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) continues to make efforts to highlight diversity, equity and inclusion in its cases and policy reviews. At their February 16, 2023 meeting, P&T members revisited the UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Plan (“Plan”) and the steps proposed by the Executive Board in their May 5, 2022 memo. P&T offers the following updates on their committee efforts.

P&T relies on a diverse membership (as defined in the bylaws and the Plan). To further increase diversity and representation while still maintaining a small enough committee for effective deliberations, P&T voted to increase membership from seven to nine. The bylaw change became effective in January, 2023. Committee members individually promote volunteering for Senate service in their respective departments, but it is hard to gauge the effectiveness of those efforts.

To make sure all members have a voice and to share the burden of cases, after some discussion over a few meetings, in January P&T voted in a process of assigning individual agenda items to members to prepare and present at each P&T meeting. Since the committee is diverse and some members have more service burden than others or are at a more research-intensive phase of their careers, the chair and members make a special effort to support those members by adjusting review and hearing committee assignments accordingly. Committee participation is excellent.

Because the oversight of faculty rights is a particular responsibility of P&T, in addition to the improvement of committee web pages, the Committee is seeking additional ways to make the committee processes more visible to faculty. Committee members find that many faculty are unaware of their professional rights, let alone the processes available to address grievances that those rights may have been violated. It seems to take some social capital to “find” the P&T process. Faculty who find their way to P&T typically were referred by another faculty member. The Committee recommends that Charges and P&T Chairs present, along with CAP Chair and Vice Chair, to the annual chairs and deans meetings and would appreciate facilitation of that effort by the Executive Board. P&T welcomes other suggestions to make faculty rights more visible to all faculty.
February 23, 2023

TO:     Jessica Cattelino, Chair, Academic Senate

FROM:  Norweeta G. Milburn, Chair, Charges Committee

Re: UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Plan

The Charges Committee frequently must review allegations of misconduct that either involve underrepresented faculty or allegations that specifically allege some element of discrimination or harassment. At their February 15, 2023 meeting, Charges members revisited the UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Plan (“Plan”) and the steps proposed by the Executive Board in their May 5, 2022 memo. Charges offers the following updates on their committee efforts.

Some Charges members report that they individually promote volunteering for Senate service in their respective departments and encouraged others to do so. Many committee members, even those with a number of years on campus, commented that they were unaware of the Charges Committee until they were nominated to serve on it! It is clear that in order to have more faculty volunteer and/or be willing to serve, that there should be more awareness on the campus of the important role Charges plays in both preserving faculty due process rights and holding faculty accountable.

The Charges Chair has been implementing the communication tips suggested to chairs in the Fall orientation to good effect. The Committee has five (of eight) new members this year, which has made dividing case review for different perspectives at the start of the year challenging. As we are mid-way through Winter Quarter, the newer faculty are gaining confidence in presenting, which improves the diversity of voices. Due to the subject matter, Charges has its share of difficult conversations. The diversity of the committee helps balance these, but it might help in future years if Senate committee members had some sort of guide to meeting participation. Charges is considering developing their own as the year progresses.

The Charges Committee has a particular responsibility that impacts DEI on campus and is therefore integral to the committee’s own DEI efforts. The intention of the disciplinary process is to preserve conditions that protect faculty rights, including the right to an environment that equally applies policies and is free from discrimination and harassment. The Committee has the following concerns that have DEI implications that are perhaps more visible to Charges: (1) It is a high bar to file charges. Any individual may file a charge, but those “embraced” by deans have more resources. Because they are less likely to be able to engage a dean to file charges, it is therefore inherently more difficult for underrepresented community members, including faculty, to file charges; (2) Faculty with more “power” and visibility may more easily avoid the charges process, which means that underrepresented faculty with little means to address charges may be more vulnerable; (3) Charges is strictly a disciplinary process. That is, it is only for imposing sanctions for “faculty misconduct that is either serious in itself or is made serious through its repetition, or its consequences.” While the Faculty Code of Conduct allows that there are “other forms of reproval and administrative actions,” there exists no mechanism to implement those. Charges believes that such a “warning” system would benefit all community members, but especially would empower those who are underrepresented.

The Committee looks forward to continued discussion of DEI efforts by the Senate and its committees.
February 23, 2023

To: Jessica Cattelino, Chair
    Academic Senate

Re: Academic Senate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Efforts

Dear Chair Cattelino,

At its meeting on February 14, 2023, the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) discussed the Academic Senate’s request on Academic Senate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Efforts. Members offered the following comments on the recommendations highlighted.

• **Formulate tools/strategies (e.g., talking points, materials, “buddies”) pertaining to your committee/council that will support the Committee on Committees’ recruitment of members and chairs, including with a focus on diversity.**
  To better represent and include a broader sense of the faculty, the committee believes the recruitment efforts of the FWC need to include junior faculty as members. It is this group that is especially dependent on the University for their welfare. It is junior faculty who often are most impacted by the University’s economic and educational decisions. A letter was sent to the Committee on Committees requesting FWC’s membership include junior faculty, specifically Assistant professors.

• **Raise DEI impacts and values in committee discussions, making DEI-related considerations an explicit and expected part of meetings, (For example, in Executive Board meetings we endeavor to ask, for each agenda item, what the DEI considerations or implications might be.)**
  The committee agreed, when a topic or issue is introduced, we will explicitly and will ask if there are DEI concerns that impact the outcome of the issue. Encouraging everyone to think more broadly viewing each agenda item with DEI and access in mind.

• **Use communication best practices to help all members feel valued and heard. Consult resources on meeting facilitation, as provided by the Senate office, for some great ideas that can improve committee meetings.**
  The Communication and Best Practices document was presented and read aloud. The committee will continue to reflect on the resources outlined to improve meeting operations and the inclusivity of thoughts and ideas.

• **Ask current and former Senate committee members to present at their department faculty meetings to encourage your colleagues to volunteer for Senate service.**
  Members are encouraged to report back to their department important issues presented to the Academic Senate and during meetings, making conscience efforts to ensure colleagues are
informed, and also developing a rapport to encourage colleagues to participate in the Academic Senate.

• **Consider the importance of diverse perspectives and experiences as you cultivate future chairs (and, when applicable, vice chairs) of your committee or council.**

  Given the great demands placed on the FWC Chair locally and systemwide, the committee advocates and is working to revise its bylaws to include a vice chair position to foster support, alleviate the service burden, and cultivate the willingness of future leaders on the committee.

• **Report on the DEI-related processes and activities of your committee or council to the Executive Board, twice in AY22-23 (January and May/June) and possibly annually thereafter.**

  The DEI-related processes and activities will be part of the committee’s annual reporting.

In addition, the Faculty Welfare Committee discussed the disproportioned and huge discrepancy in workload placed on underrepresented faculty, faculty of color, and women in particular. These populations are overburdened, exploited, and not given enough time to teach, do research, or do other work. We recommend the Academic Senate carefully consider how this population is called upon for service, and cautiously think about how resources are allocated to support this group of faculty.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our recommendation. If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at bonacich@soc.ucla.edu or via the Committee analyst, Renee Rouzan-Kay, at rrouzankay@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

 Phillip Bonacich, Chair
 Faculty Welfare Committee

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, Faculty Welfare Committee
    Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee
February 22, 2023

TO: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, Academic Senate

FR: Robert N. Watson, Chair, Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools

RE: UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Plan

At its meeting on February 17, 2023, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS) reviewed the August 29, 2022, letter from the Executive Board providing suggestions to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion within the Academic Senate.

Members reaffirmed the importance of incorporating diversity into the constitution and conduct of the committee, as discussed in the memo to the Executive Board dated December 6, 2022. Members noted that DEI-related considerations are embedded into all agenda items brought before the committee—for example, striving to ensure equitable and inclusive admissions policies, and helping UCLA reach its goal to become a Hispanic Serving Institution.

CUARS will continue to center DEI in its deliberations on issues affecting undergraduate admissions, and will endeavor to remain aware of any implicit biases in how these issues are discussed.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide an update. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via Committee Analyst Julia Nelsen at jnelsen@senate.ucla.edu.

CC: April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Andrew Fuligni, Vice Chair, CUARS
Andrea Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
Julia Nelsen, Principal Policy Analyst, CUARS
Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
February 21, 2023

To: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: James Bisley, Chair, Graduate Council

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

At its meeting on February 10, 2023, the Graduate Council reviewed and discussed the memorandum regarding promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at the UCLA Academic Senate and offered the following for the Executive Board’s consideration:

- **Communication:** Members stressed the importance of acknowledging Senate service and communicating the value of service to deans and department chairs. Members also stated that it would be beneficial for the Senate to be aware of faculty departmental commitments when nominating faculty for Senate service. Some faculty may feel compelled to accept service nominations while already overtaxed with departmental service.

- **Protection of junior faculty:** Members noted that junior faculty, which includes assistant and associate faculty, should be protected from being overburdened with service. Mentorship of junior faculty should include conversations regarding service, the type of service, and hours of service commitment that would be appropriate for junior faculty members at specific stages in their careers.

- **Compensation:** Members commented that guidelines and opportunities for providing compensation should be communicated to departments, deans, and faculty to support and encourage diverse participation. Members are concerned about equity as faculty with similar service levels are not equally and fairly compensated across departments, divisions, and schools.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this status update. If you have any questions, please contact us via Graduate Council’s Analyst, Emily Le, at ele@senate.ucla.edu.
February 15, 2023

TO: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, Academic Senate

FR: Kathy Bawn, Chair, Undergraduate Council

RE: UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Plan

At its meeting on February 10, 2023, members of the Undergraduate Council (UgC) reviewed the August 29, 2022 letter from the Executive Board and discussed the Council’s progress to date in fostering diversity, equity and inclusion in the Academic Senate.

A key issue impacting diverse participation on the Council has been workload. Some members noted that UgC service has felt more manageable of late compared to previous years—particularly at the height of the pandemic—thanks to an overall reduction in online meetings, as well as steps taken to streamline the Council’s agendas and tasks. Members welcome further efforts to mitigate workload, such as the creation of new committees for program review and course approvals, while emphasizing the importance of robust mentorship and orientation to engage diverse faculty in shared governance. We are encouraging members to be UgC “ambassadors” to help with recruitment amongst their colleagues.

Members also discussed practices to improve communication during Council meetings. Several thought it was helpful to take periodic “temperature checks” on issues with a show of hands, as happened in a recent discussion, in order to capture the sentiments of members who may not always speak up. Members encouraged calling on each other and making space for quieter participants to add their input, so that everyone can have a chance to meaningfully contribute.

UgC welcomes continued conversations on this important topic.

CC: April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Andrea Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Julia Nelsen, Principal Policy Analyst, Undergraduate Council
    Anne Warlaumont, Vice Chair, Undergraduate Council
    Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
To: Jessica Cattelino, Chair, Academic Senate  
From: Chon Noriega, Chair, Council on Academic Personnel  
Cc: Andrea M. Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate  
Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Lori Ishimaru, Senior Policy Analyst, Academic Senate  
Members of the Council on Academic Personnel  
Date: February 7, 2023  
Re: UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Plan, Part I  

At its meetings on September 13, 2022, and January 24, 2023, the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) discussed Part I of the UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Plan.

In Spring 2022, CAP’s bylaws were amended so its members “hold the rank of full professor, typically at or above Step VI”; and in Fall 2022, ClinCAP’s bylaws were amended so its members “hold the rank of full professor,” removing any step expectation. These revisions are intended to allow greater flexibility in the recruitment of members. However, selection of faculty at lower steps should be done judiciously, as CAP requires a significant time commitment. The disproportionate service commitment may impede a faculty’s ability to sustain and continue excellence in teaching and research and negatively impact timely progress towards Step VI. The Senate should also be sensitive to the “minority tax” and ensure that minority faculty are not unduly overburdened by service responsibilities.

CAP members and former members of the Committee on Committees (ConC) identified inequitable compensation as a possible reason faculty are discouraged from serving on CAP. As described in CAP’s December 2022 budget request to the Executive Board, UCLA CAP receives lower compensation than other UC CAPs and the compensation received is not equally received between members. Ensuring equity among members and increasing UCLA CAP’s compensation to that of its sister campuses, will assist in recruitment of both DGSOM and diverse faculty to serve on CAP.

CAP has published guidance on faculty service that provides recommendations how to report and recognize extensive service. CAP is currently reviewing and updating all its guidance documents.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the Senate’s DEI efforts. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at cnoriega@ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Lori Ishimaru, at lishimaru@senate.ucla.edu.
To: Jessica Cattelino, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Marco Giovannini, Chair  
Committee on International Education

Date: February 3, 2023

Re: UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Plan, Part I

The Committee on International Education’s (CIE) work with international education and international students and scholars is inherently tied to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). For example, at its November 30, 2022 meeting, CIE discussed promoting DEI in study abroad. Comments and suggestions including programs for DACA students, considering opportunities to raise general awareness and participation in specific destinations, developing more STEM programs, and outreaching with student organizations.

CIE will report on the DEI-related processes and activities of our committee to the Executive Board again in AY22-23. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the Committee on International Education analyst, Lori Ishimaru, at lishimaru@senate.ucla.edu.
August 29, 2022

To: AY2022-23 Committee and Council Chairs and FEC Chairs

From: Jessica Cattelino, UCLA Academic Senate Chair

Cc: Andrea Kasko, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
    Shane White, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
    Divisional Committee and Council Analysts

Re: UCLA Academic Senate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Plan, Part I

At its February 3, 2022, meeting, the Executive Board approved a motion to have a small working group of members make suggestions for concrete next steps for the UCLA Academic Senate (Senate) to improve its diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). The working group (Jessica Cattelino, Greg Leazer, Tara Peris, and April de Stefano) identified three areas of focus for Senate DEI: 1) diversifying and emphasizing inclusion in Senate committees and leaders, 2) Program Review, and 3) judicial committees.

This document, part one of the proposed plan, focuses on diversifying and emphasizing inclusion in Senate committees and leaders, with the following goals:

1. Cultivate diverse leaders
2. Improve data collection and analysis to advance recruitment of members and leaders
3. Take concrete steps to improve climate and foster inclusion on all committees and councils

At its May 12, 2022, meeting, Executive Board members reviewed an earlier version of this proposed plan. Members approved a motion to endorse this document after editorial changes, and distribute to committees. The document below reflects these revisions.

RECOMMENDED ACTION ITEMS FOR DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

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 use of the volunteer list.
2. Document recruitment methodology for selecting members including the principles governing selection and measurements for DEI progress.
3. Review the efficacy of recruitment communications and internal processes.
4. In discussion with CAP (see below), reconsider the longstanding Senate practice of expecting that CAP members are Full Professor series, Step VI or higher.
5. In collaboration with CDITP (see below), consider the feasibility, scope, essential data elements, and appropriateness of developing a database of all Senate faculty for recruitment for Senate service. And/or, consider the possibility of using Opus for related purposes.

6. Annually, report to the Executive Board on these matters.

Recommendation for the Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy (CDITP)

1. In collaboration with ConC (see above), consider the feasibility scope, essential data elements, and appropriateness of developing a database of all Senate faculty for recruitment for Senate service, and of using Opus for related purposes.

Recommendations for the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP)

1. In discussion with ConC (see above), reconsider the long-standing Senate practice of expecting that CAP members are Full Professor series, Step VI or higher.

2. Building off of the Senate and Academic Personnel Office memo in spring 2021, develop additional guidance for CAP members as well as departments and schools on better recognition for service in academic personnel process. Plan for and document annual member training on this issue, and report on this annually to the Executive Board.

Recommendation for the Committee of Faculty Chairs (CFC)

1. Discuss ways to work effectively with respective FECs and schools/divisions to develop a deeper pool of candidates running for ConC seats (e.g. better explain what it is, what it does, mentorship, cultivating interest).

Recommendations for all Committee and Council Chairs in AY2022-23

2. Formulate tools/strategies (e.g. talking points, materials, “buddies”) to assist ConC recruitment of members and chairs, including with a focus on diversity.

3. Inform new committee members about Senate-related DEI issues, expectations, and approaches to issues (e.g. consider DEI impacts, values, etc. in committee discussions, make DEI-related considerations an explicit and expected part of committee processes).

4. Discuss intentional ways to help all members feel valued and heard on your committee/council (e.g. build cohorts or help members bond without creating a time sink).

5. Develop onboarding materials and/or practices for new committee members to understand how DEI issues are relevant to your committee’s charge and conduct.

6. Ask current and former Senate committee members and Leadership to present their experiences with Senate service at department faculty meetings to encourage your colleagues to volunteer.

7. Consider the importance of diverse perspectives and experiences as you cultivate future chairs (and, when applicable, vice chairs) of your committee or council.


9. Report on the DEI-related processes and activities of your committee or council to the Executive Board, twice in AY22-23 (January and May/June) and possibly annually thereafter.

Recommendations for the UCLA Academic Senate Chair

1. Lead an Executive Board review of ConC’s DEI-related practices and plans.

2. Lead the Executive Board to develop a suite of suggested DEI-related questions to guide committee and council discussions. (Questions might include: Whose voice isn’t present? Where
do we not have input that would be valuable? Where are there possible unintended harms?)
Ask the EDI office for any resources and suggestions.
3. Develop a Chairs’ Orientation for Fall 2022 that thematizes and emphasizes DEI goals.
4. Ask all committees/councils to submit a mid-year and final reports on DEI efforts and outcomes in AY 2022-23.
5. Mid-year, remind committee and council chairs of above recommendations and support them as necessary in meeting them. Work with Vice Chair, Immediate Past Chair, and Executive Director to diversify the Leadership pipeline and build inclusion.

**Recommendations for the Executive Director**
1. Work with ConC Chair and Analyst to review the efficacy of their recruitment communication and internal processes.
2. Support the Senate Chair’s DEI projects, as recommended above.
3. Work with Assistant Directors to train Analysts to foster committee and council DEI work.
4. Explore options for Senate-specific DEI trainings of staff and committee/council members.

For a summary of recent UCLA Academic Senate work on DEI issues, see the April 18, 2022, letter titled “Progress Report on UCLA Academic Senate Response to the 2021 MRIC Report.”
Promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at the UCLA Academic Senate

Report to UCLA Academic Senate Leadership
Aileen Liu, Ph.D.
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Executive Summary

This report summarizes challenges and opportunities, and offers recommendations for Senate Leadership to consider for promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) at UCLA.¹ The recommendations are based on analysis of interviews with UCLA Senate faculty, reports related to DEI at UCLA and UC, research about implicit bias trainings, and implicit bias trainings.

The recommendations are:

1. Increase diversity of Senate committees and Senate Leadership.
   1.1 Publish and conduct periodic analyses of Senate committee demographics by gender, race and ethnicity, discipline, and rank.
   1.2 Mitigate bias in the selection process.
   1.3 Broaden the volunteer and candidate pools.
   1.4 Be transparent about compensation for Senate service, and advocate for compensation for Senate service where possible.
   1.5 Reward and document service.
2. Create resources to support Senate committees and chairs to engage in DEI work.
   2.1 Require implicit bias training for faculty serving in the Senate.
   2.2 Require implicit bias training for Senate staff.
   2.3 Establish norms of engagement in Senate meetings and work, and mechanisms to encourage adherence to these norms.
   2.4 Appoint strategic advisers to Senate Leadership, Senate committee chairs, and Senate committees.
3. Publicize the Senate’s commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
4. Hold units accountable for improving climate.
5. Ensure that faculty have the support they need to succeed at UCLA.
6. Implement practices for mitigating implicit bias.
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This report was undertaken in 2020–21 by Dr. Aileen Liu as a participant in the UCLA Professional Development Program (PDP).² The report was sponsored by Professors Shane White, Jody Kreiman, and Michael Meranze—Senate Leadership in 2020–21—and Senate Executive Director Dr. April de Stefano.

Introduction

When this report was initiated in September 2020, UCLA was—and still is—in the throes of several crises: the COVID-19 pandemic and the campus’ rapid transition to remote learning and operations; the

---

¹ This report refers to diversity, equity, and inclusion as “DEI” in order to distinguish the concept from the UCLA Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, also referred to as “the EDI Office.”
² “PDP was launched in 1994 to provide the University with highly trained and qualified staff prepared to move into leadership positions. This one-year leadership development program provides participants in PSS 2-6 classifications with opportunities to enhance professional and management skills, build professional networks, and learn about the structure and culture of the University.” A major program component is a “Capstone Project – Participants will complete an individual project that improves a process, solves a problem, or otherwise provides a benefit to their department” (https://www.chr.ucla.edu/training-and-development/professional-development-program-pdp)
The pandemic’s immediate and anticipated impact on the campus budget, including a pause in faculty hiring; and several high-profile incidents of anti-black racism and violence in the United States in spring 2020, in particular the killings of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery. These incidents ignited public attention to systemic racism—already thrown into sharp relief by the unequal impacts of the pandemic—and led to protests and demonstrations in Los Angeles and across the globe that called for racial justice.

As protests were gathering steam in the week following Memorial Day, several UCLA units—including the Anderson School of Management, the David Geffen School of Medicine (DGSOM), the School of Law, the Samueli School of Engineering, the School of Dentistry, the School of Nursing, the Division of Physical Sciences, the Library, and the Staff Assembly—published statements of support. On May 30, 2020, a memo titled “The Pain Behind the Protests” was sent to the UCLA community, signed by 37 senior leaders, including the UCLA Academic Senate Chair. The memo reaffirmed UCLA’s belief that equity, respect and justice are central to the character of our institution, to the health of our democracy and to the well-being of our world. Still, we recognize that UCLA also can and must do better. As campus leaders, we recommit ourselves to ensuring that our policies and actions value the lives, safety and dignity of every Bruin.

UC offices also sent statements of support. On May 31, 2020, UC President Janet Napolitano and UC Board of Regents Chair John A. Pérez sent a statement to the UC community, which urged us all to “examine our own biases and find a way to eliminate the systemic racial inequities that pervade our country in order to effect real and lasting change.” And on June 3, 2020, the Academic Council of the UC Academic Senate—a body that includes the UCLA Academic Senate Chair—published a memo titled “A Moment of Silence and Reflection” that stated, “On all UC campuses, we must listen and, crucially, do more to combat systemic oppression, including anti-black racism.”

Two themes emerge from these statements: an assertion of institutional commitment to DEI, and a call to action and change on individual and institutional levels—to “do more” and to “do better.” Since that watershed moment in the days and weeks after Memorial Day 2020, the question has been: What are you and your institutions doing to do more, and better? This report seeks to support current and future Senate Leadership in answering that question.

The report had three primary goals: (1) to understand how the Senate currently promotes DEI; (2) to understand existing challenges, barriers, and gaps in that work; and (3) to develop recommendations and best practices to improve the Senate’s ability to promote DEI.

Methodology

The methodology for this report was to solicit input from UCLA Senate faculty about their experiences and perceptions of the Senate; to gather information from previous studies of DEI issues at UCLA and
the University of California; and to gather information and best practices from implicit bias trainings as well as research about the efficacy of such trainings.

From September 2020 to March 2021, Liu conducted one-on-one interviews with 38 Senate faculty (Appendix 1). Liu also reviewed nine task force and committee reports related to DEI at UCLA and the UC published in the last decade as well as peer-reviewed research about implicit bias trainings (Appendix 2), and participated in three implicit bias trainings offered at UCLA and UC (Appendix 3). This report addresses themes raised in these interviews, studies, and trainings.

Findings

A total of 38 Senate faculty were interviewed for this report, with at least one faculty member from almost every Division in the College and almost every professional School. The majority of the Senate faculty interviewed are faculty of color. The majority are full professors; the rest are emeriti, associate, and assistant professors. Most have served on Senate committees, and several have served in senior administrative positions, Senate leadership positions, or both. (See Appendix 1.)

From these one-on-one interviews with Senate faculty, the following themes emerged about perceptions of Senate committee representation and how the Senate currently promotes DEI:

1. Faculty perceive that the Senate does not represent their constituencies and needs, and perceive that faculty who serve on Senate committees and as Senate Leadership are not representative of the diversity of Senate faculty at UCLA along the lines of gender, race and ethnicity, and discipline.
   a. Notably, there was a lack of consensus among faculty interviewed about which groups were underrepresented and why. This lack of consensus suggests an opportunity for the Senate to conduct an analysis of its committee demographics.
2. Faculty perceive that the Senate does not consistently act to promote DEI, and at times has acted in opposition to these values.
   a. For example, several faculty described the Senate as a body that protects faculty in misconduct cases. Other faculty described a perceived conflict in values between the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI) and the Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF). These perceptions suggest an opportunity for the Senate to consider how it communicates its mission and work to the broader UCLA community.
3. Faculty perceive that the Senate has authority over curriculum, program review, and student admissions, and influence over faculty review and faculty hiring. However, faculty perceive program review as lacking teeth when it comes to holding academic and administrative units accountable for improving climate and DEI. Faculty also perceive CODEI to be powerless to effect real change when it comes to policies to advance faculty diversity through recruitment, advancement, and retention.
   a. For example, one faculty member noted that, although CODEI’s bylaws specify that the Committee “advises the Chancellor on proposals for waivers of search for academic appointments of ‘targets of opportunity,’” their advisory role is inconsistent at best.

---

6 Not represented among the 38 Senate faculty interviewed: Division of Physical Sciences, School of the Arts and Architecture, and School of Nursing.
These perceptions suggest an opportunity for the Senate to consider existing and new opportunities to leverage its direct authority and influence.

4. Faculty perceive Senate committee service as “exclusive” and “by invitation only.” Some faculty are seen as “lifers” who cycle from one Senate committee to the next. Some faculty who are interested in serving are never invited and do not know why.

One faculty member described serving on a Senate committee as eye-opening, with committee meetings as “overwhelmingly white” spaces. Another faculty member described witnessing microaggressions—“Did I just hear that?” moments—that seemed to go unacknowledged and unaddressed. One faculty member said, “I was disappointed to not see the Senate send a strong message and take a stand [in the wake of the 2020 racial justice protests]. If they have, I haven’t seen it. I’ve heard more from administration about commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion. Faculty have to own this problem as our problem, and be committed to working with administration to be part of creating solutions.”

From the interviews with 38 Senate faculty and studies of DEI issues at UCLA and the University of California, the following themes emerged about institutional and structural barriers for the Senate to promote DEI and to diversify Senate committees and Senate Leadership. Notably, several of these issues have been further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on faculty productivity, advancement, morale, work-life balance, and dependent care responsibilities:

1. Too few women and people of color are hired into Senate faculty positions, tenured, promoted to full, and retained.
2. Female faculty and faculty of color are disproportionately burdened by service work, both formal (e.g. committee work) and informal (e.g. mentorship), extra office hours, service to communities beyond the campus, “diversity work”).
3. Service is not adequately recognized or valued in the tenure, merit, and promotion process.
   a. Some faculty attributed this challenge to narrow definitions of achievement and excellence, and what kinds of contributions are valued.
   b. Some faculty described service, especially mentorship, as gendered and racialized “domestic labor” and “invisible work.”
   c. Many faculty identified, as a recent “win,” the added requirement of a “Diversity Statement” for regular rank faculty candidates and ladder rank faculty promotions.

---

7 “Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty.”
8 Several faculty members noted that individuals that hold non-Senate titles—e.g. adjunct professors, lecturers without security of employment (see Appendix 4)—are more likely to be women, people of color, and from low-income communities. Individuals in these non-Senate titles also carry out a large share of the university’s teaching mission. These faculty members suggested reconsidering which titles are part of Senate membership, as a way to immediately increase the diversity of the pool of Senate faculty eligible to serve on Senate committees, and to ensure that these populations have a seat at the table. Notably, a 2010 UC Task Force on Senate Membership chose not to “recommend transfer of existing non-Senate titles to Senate membership nor the creation of new Senate titles,” but did recommend “a review of faculty in the Health Sciences and transfer of faculty to the appropriate titles based upon the expectations of their positions and actual duties” (“Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership”).
9 In 2018, the UCLA Mentoring and Evaluation of Graduate Academic Progress (MEGAP) Workgroup recommended that “the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the Academic Personnel Office (APO) [be encouraged] to integrate mentoring into the promotion and review of faculty” (“MEGAP Workgroup Report”).
10 “UCLA Faculty Service Report.”
4. The workload of certain types of Senate service (e.g. members of committees that meet every other week, specific committee chairs) is especially burdensome and uncompensated, which may be a barrier for equitable faculty participation.\textsuperscript{12}

Multiple faculty described the way that faculty from marginalized groups are further marginalized by structures, policies, and practices at UCLA. One faculty member said, “Changing these structures is not an act of charity. It will help everyone.” However, several faculty members described “diversity work” within the Senate and at UCLA more broadly as an “uphill battle.” As one faculty member put it, “[Diversity work] is pushing a Mack truck up a hill by yourself.” Another faculty member said, “[Diversity work] is important, but you have to be crazy to do it.” One faculty member who chaired a Senate committee said that working to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion through the committee “was a tremendous amount of work, difficult work, that no one cared about and no one recognized” when it came to their promotion case.

These findings informed the following principles for this report’s recommendations:

1. DEI must be understood as a shared responsibility of all faculty and all Senate committees, not only CODEI, and not only faculty from marginalized groups.
   a. One study indicated that women and people of color who engage in diversity-valuing behavior—defined as “behavior as that which promotes demographic balance within organizations”—“are penalized in terms of how others perceive their competence and effectiveness.” White or male leaders are not penalized for engaging in diversity-valuing behavior, nor are they rewarded.\textsuperscript{13}

2. Coalition-building is important, but it is not enough to get the “right people” to serve. For DEI to be a shared responsibility at the Senate, there must be structural change and support in the form of resources and accountability. The Senate should examine its structures, practices, policies, and norms to understand how they may promote inequality and replicate biases, and introduce changes.
   a. Several faculty spoke positively about the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion’s seven-part video series on implicit bias, required for service on faculty search committees.

3. Initiatives to diversify Senate committees and Senate Leadership must go hand-in-hand with initiatives to properly value and compensate service, mitigate institutional barriers for female faculty and faculty of color, and improve climate at the Senate and at UCLA—all of which are within the Senate’s authority and influence.

Finally, one additional theme that emerged from faculty interviews was how faculty choose to devote their time and energy at different stages of their faculty careers, and how they approach the question of how they want to make an impact. One faculty member explained, “We choose to serve the community insofar as we care about that community. Faculty who serve have a sense of community, feel connected

\textsuperscript{12} The 2010 UC Task Force on Senate Membership identified “equitable participation in Senate deliberations” as an area of concern: “We were concerned that the combination of continued budget cuts with increases in classroom size and instructional demands across the faculty may render some segments of the University, e.g., those unable to obtain release time or funding, unable to participate fully in shared governance. This issue will need to be monitored by the systemwide Academic Senate and steps taken to address workload issues that may severely limit faculty participation in service activities” (“Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership”).

\textsuperscript{13} Hekman et al (2016).
to the larger community, care for it and value it.” The following two comments are illustrative of this point: One faculty member, when asked why she has served on Senate and systemwide committees for 20+ years, said, “UCLA took me in. Everything good in my life is from UCLA.” Another faculty member, when asked why she directs much of her service work toward supporting communities outside of campus, said, “Higher education has not been welcoming to me [as a woman of color]. So why would I be invested in institution-building?” The question of how faculty make choices around the question of impact at different stages of their career—and how the Senate can better position itself as an option for faculty seeking to make an impact—are beyond the scope of this report, and may be worth pursuing.

Recommendations

1 Increase diversity of Senate committees and Senate Leadership.

All Senate committees and Senate Leadership should be diverse along the lines of gender, race and ethnicity, and discipline. Given their responsibilities, the following should be prioritized: Senate Leadership, committee chairs, Council on Academic Personnel (CAP), Committee on Committees (ConC), Committee on Charges (Charges), Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T), Graduate Council (GC), and Undergraduate Council (UgC).

1.1 Publish and conduct periodic analyses of Senate committee demographics by gender, race and ethnicity, discipline, and rank.

- Publishing committee demographics data on the Senate website will foster transparency and accountability.\(^{14}\)
- Conducting routine analyses will allow the Senate to understand trends over time and take proactive steps to address imbalances.

1.2 Mitigate bias in the selection process.

- Articulate objective criteria for ranking and selecting nominees to Senate committees, in order to reduce bias and arbitrary, capricious judgments.
- Reconsider the long-standing campus practice of expecting that CAP members be Full Professor, Step VI or higher. Faculty Salary Equity Studies show that disparities increase as faculty ranks increase; this practice replicates and compounds existing disparities with respect to groups based on gender and/or race and ethnicity.\(^{15}\)

1.3 Broaden the volunteer and candidate pools.

- Target faculty to encourage them to volunteer for Senate committees or run for elected Senate positions (e.g., Senate Vice Chair and ConC membership). One group of faculty to consider

---

\(^{14}\) The Senate would need to create infrastructure to publish these data in a more automated way, akin to the Office of EDI’s Senate Faculty Workforce Diversity (no DGSOM) Dashboard [https://equity.ucla.edu/data-hub/senate-faculty-diversity](https://equity.ucla.edu/data-hub/senate-faculty-diversity) and the recently launched David Geffen School of Medicine Dashboards [https://tableau.uclanet.ucla.edu/t/apb/views/ARRDashboard/Faculty-Gender](https://tableau.uclanet.ucla.edu/t/apb/views/ARRDashboard/Faculty-Gender), which show the diversity of DGSOM faculty, staff and trainees.

\(^{15}\) “Salary Equity Study Recommendations.”
targeting is alumni of the Office of Faculty Development’s Faculty Leadership Development Program.\textsuperscript{16}

- Ask current and former Senate committee members and Leadership to present about their experiences with Senate service at department meetings and encourage their colleagues to volunteer.
- Share professional accomplishments of current and former Senate committee members and Leadership on the Senate website and social media, to demonstrate that Senate service attracts top faculty and is a leadership development opportunity.

1.4 Be transparent about compensation for Senate service, and advocate for compensation for Senate service where possible.

- Be transparent about compensation when nominating faculty to Senate positions that receive compensation in the form of stipends, research funds, summer ninths, and/or course releases.
- Periodically review which Senate positions receive compensation for above-and-beyond service, through the lens of equity. For example, given how central DEI is on campus and the workload carried by the CODEI Chair, consider whether that position should receive compensation.
- Be transparent about the process for requesting compensation for above-and-beyond Senate service.
- Encourage department chairs and deans to compensate their faculty’s Senate committee service, e.g. through course releases or sabbatical credits.
- Continue to advocate, at the systemwide and campus levels, for compensation for key Senate positions.

1.5 Reward and document service.

- Improve documentation of what Senate committee members and chairs have done and accomplished, to provide promotion committees with a better sense of the scope and impact of the faculty member’s service. Include quantitative and qualitative evidence.
- Reward service in promotion and advancement. For example, take into consideration Senate committee service for promotion to Step VI.
- Encourage departments and Deans to reward service in promotion and advancement.

2 Create resources to support Senate committees and chairs to engage in DEI work.

Formal structures and resources can help to ensure that “diversity work” does not continue to default to faculty of color and female faculty who serve on Senate committees, or the Chair of CODEI, which is

\textsuperscript{16} The UCLA Faculty Leadership Development Program was initiated in Fall 2017 on EVCP Scott Waugh’s request. EVCP Waugh envisioned that the program would provide “associate professors, who have interest in leadership positions, with insight into the structure, funding and governance of UCLA,” and “broaden opportunities for participation in academic leadership for women and members of minority groups.” As of 2020, the program consists of five components: (1) a one-day Introduction to Leadership Workshop for 25–30 advanced Associate and early full Professors with service inclinations; (2) a six-month Faculty Leadership Academy for 15–20 faculty who have completed the Workshop; (3) a six-part New and Continuing Chairs Training for cohorts of 25 new and continuing department chairs; (4) a seven-part Senior Administrative Leadership Onboarding (SALO) program for new Deans, Vice Chancellors, and Vice Provosts; and (5) special workshops and consultations for faculty leaders, including department chairs and directors, on specific issues including civility and misconduct (https://www.apo.ucla.edu/faculty-resources/career-development).
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Currently an uncompensated Senate position. In addition to easing the burden on underrepresented groups, formal structures and resources send the message that DEI is a Senate-wide responsibility.

2.1 Require implicit bias training for faculty serving in the Senate.

Provide education for faculty on recognizing and addressing bias, including gender and racial bias and implicit bias. Given their responsibilities, the following should be prioritized: Senate Leadership, committee chairs, CAP and ClinCAP, \(^{17}\) ConC, Charges, P&T, Grievance Advisory Committee (GAC), GC, and UgC.

- Provide UC/CSU Moving Beyond Bias in-person workshops, led and facilitated by faculty who have been trained as trainers, or better yet, current and former Senate committee chairs and Leadership after they have been trained as trainers; or
- Provide the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI)’s online seven-part video series on implicit bias, ~30 minutes total. Consider augmenting the video series with a set of reflection questions tailored to Senate committee service.
- Allow faculty to opt out of training if they have completed implicit bias training through the EDI Office to serve on a faculty search committee within X number of years (e.g. three).

2.2 Require implicit bias training for Senate staff.

Senate staff can and do influence Senate committees’ practices, procedures, and norms. Staff provide institutional continuity for Senate committees and Senate Leadership, which turn over every year. Staff are positioned to socialize committee chairs and members in behavioral norms and practices that can perpetuate the status quo, or promote and sustain the cultural change we wish to see.

- Provide UC/CSU Moving Beyond Bias in-person workshops, led and facilitated by faculty who have been trained as trainers; or
- Provide a customized workshop designed and led by a faculty member or equity advisor; \(^{18}\) or
- Provide the UC online six-part implicit bias modules for employees, 20–30 minutes each. Consider augmenting the modules with a set of reflection questions tailored to Senate work, and/or facilitated conversations with all staff.
- Empower and train staff to speak up, ask questions, and advise committee chairs to ensure that attention is paid to issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion.
- Empower and train staff to recognize and interrupt—or prompt committee chairs to interrupt—attitudes and practices rooted in bias (e.g. microaggressions).

---

\(^{17}\) This recommendation echoes the UC Academic Council’s recommendation that campuses “provide and require anti-bias training for all members of promotion committees, from the department level on up” (“Mitigating,” p. 5).

\(^{18}\) Due to their research expertise, some faculty have already been called on to design and lead trainings for other campus units. For example, Ben Refuerzo (Professor of Architecture and Urban Design) led a session at a Division of Undergraduate Education retreat in 2020; and Mitchell Chang (Professor of Education and of Asian American Studies) and Tyrone Howard (Professor of Education) have been working with Athletics’ anti-racism committee in 2020–21 to develop workshops for coaches and student athletes.
2.3 Establish norms of engagement in Senate meetings and work, and mechanisms to encourage adherence to these norms.

- Establish norms for interactions and behavior, including in Senate meetings and committee work. Norms could address inappropriate comments or behaviors rooted in bias (e.g., microaggressions). Norms could also include clear warnings against interruptions.
- Provide training for faculty and staff, particularly Senate committee chairs and Senate Leadership, on skills for conflict management, confronting bias, and constructive dialogue.
- Support Senate committee chairs to counsel members who violate norms. Create processes to remove members for persistent failure or inability to follow norms.
- Consider behavior that violates norms when appointing faculty to committees.

2.4 Appoint strategic advisers to Senate Leadership, Senate committee chairs, and Senate committees.

- Appoint a faculty member to act as a strategic adviser to Senate Leadership, Senate committee chairs, and Senate committees. This adviser would provide guidance for promoting and sustaining diversity, equity, and inclusion in all aspects of the Senate’s work, akin to the work done by Faculty Equity Advisors in departments and academic units on campus. The position should receive compensation. The position could be appointed for a multi-year term to ensure institutional continuity, and could serve as an ex officio member of CODEI. The faculty member appointed to this position should be someone with Senate experience and credibility.
- Support CODEI in reimagining its charge, including how CODEI supports diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus, and how CODEI could act as an advisory body to other Senate committees on issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

3 Publicize the Senate’s commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The Senate, particularly via the actions of Senate Leadership, should consistently and publicly demonstrate commitment to promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion. Demonstrating the Senate’s commitment is culture informing, and provides examples for Senate committees and others to extrapolate from.

- Clarify the Senate’s mission and goals vis-à-vis diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- In addition to articulating present commitment to DEI, understand, grapple with, document, and acknowledge past failures in this work.19

---

19 “In June 2014, all schools and academic units were asked to appoint an Equity Advisor, who would take leadership on matters of equity, diversity, and inclusion within their institution. Distributed throughout the University, these Equity Advisors leverage their direct experience with local culture and climate to advise their deans in terms of strategy, policy, training, climate, and accountability. Roles and responsibilities vary; however, many Equity Advisors play an important role in faculty training, monitoring the faculty search and other hiring processes, improving climate, and consulting on matters of equity, diversity, and inclusion. Although Equity Advisors report directly to their deans, they also work closely with and provide invaluable advice to the Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion. They constitute the most important advisory council for the Office” (https://equity.ucla.edu/about-us/our-teams/equity-advisors).

20 Multiple faculty members identified, as an example of historical failures of the Senate, the resistance and challenges leading up to the passage of the Diversity Requirement in 2014–15. As one faculty member described, UCLA was the only UC campus at that time—with the exception of the newest campus, UC Merced—to not have a diversity requirement. Another faculty member identified the 1993 hunger strike following Chancellor Charles E. Young’s announcement that the Chicano Studies Program would not receive departmental status (https://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/kt0b69p9s1).
• Publish DEI Award and Distinguished Teaching Award recipients’ profiles and personal statements on the Senate website and social media.
• Continue to make DEI a priority for every Senate committee, and not “only” CODEI.
• Add to Senate committees’ annual reports a section on contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
• Highlight Senate accomplishments that promote DEI on the Senate website and social media. These accomplishments could be pulled from committees’ annual reports.
• Publish Senate committees’ annual reports on the Senate website, to enhance transparency and accountability.

4 Hold units accountable for improving climate.

To hold the campus accountable for improving climate and promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion, the Senate must improve collaboration and communication with academic units and administration. Accountability is crucial for program review, where the Senate has direct authority through GC and UgC; and for faculty review and faculty hiring, where the Senate has influence through CAP, ClinCAP, Charges, and P&T, and more indirect influence through program review reports and recommendations.

• Hold academic units accountable for improving climate and DEI through the program review process. Collaborate with the EVC/P and the EDI Office to assess progress and impose timely consequences (e.g. suspension of faculty hiring, suspension of graduate admissions) for persistent failure or inability to address issues.
• Advocate for campus mechanisms to address significant climate concerns in academic units when they’re identified by the program review process. Collaborate with campus administration (e.g. the EVC/P, the EDI Office, the Academic Personnel Office) to ensure that these mechanisms are in place and effective.
• Educate program review team members about potential recommendations and resources to help units improve climate and DEI. Encourage review teams to use CODEI’s issue statements to identify issues as well as potential recommendations and resources. Encourage review team members to interview students and junior faculty and to spotlight their voices in the review team report, to identify specific climate issues and provide guidance.

5 Ensure that faculty have the support they need to succeed at UCLA.

• Attend department, Chairs, and/or FEC meetings to educate faculty about what the Senate is, what it does, and how it can support faculty.
• Promote the Grievance Advisory Committee (GAC) as a resource for individual faculty.21
• Educate department chairs and Deans about the reality and impact of unequal service burdens, and the disparate impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty.22 Partner with the Academic

21 GAC’s charge: “GAC faculty members are available on an individual basis to explain grievance procedures and what constitutes faculty rights and privileges. ...The Committee assists faculty, staff, and students in discerning whether their matter is a grievance or charge and with choosing the appropriate route for a formal complaint or grievance. ... Unless they involve an incident that requires mandatory reporting (such as violence, danger to self or others, or sexual harassment/violence) all queries and consultations are treated as confidential.”
22 This recommendation echoes the UC Academic Council’s recommendation that campuses “Establish a culture of awareness of the disparate impacts of the COVID-era on career success across the academic and university spectrum, including impacts on
Personnel Office and the Office of Faculty Development to co-facilitate workshops for department chairs, directors, and faculty.

- Advocate for increased resources for faculty mentorship, professional development, and support, particularly for junior faculty, female faculty, and faculty of color (e.g. through the Council of Advisers and the Office of Faculty Development).

6 Implement practices for mitigating implicit bias.

Studies show that stress, fatigue, and distraction can trigger implicit bias. Implement practices that reduce situational triggers: give time to pause, reduce fatigue, reduce stress, and reduce distraction. These practices should be implemented throughout the Senate’s work, including but not limited to Senate committee meetings, Leadership meetings, staff meetings, and program review site visit meetings.

- Discuss trickiest items first during meetings, when people are less fatigued and distracted.
- Schedule meetings earlier in the day. Do not schedule meetings at lunch time or at the end of the day.
- Schedule shorter meetings: 45 minutes instead of 1 hour; 90 minutes instead of 2 hours.
- Schedule breaks during longer meetings.

---

faculty, students, postdocs/trainees, and staff. This cultural shift should emanate from top leadership, beginning at the Office of the President and the Chair of the Academic Senate” (“Mitigating,” p. 5).

23 Devine et al (2012). These practices are taught in the UC/CSU “Moving Beyond Bias” workshops.
Appendix 1: List of Interviews

A total of 38 Senate faculty members were interviewed, including 3 of 3 of current Senate Leadership (2020–21). Each interview was conducted by Aileen Liu, and lasted 30–60 minutes.

The table below lists all Senate faculty who were interviewed for this report, including their titles and affiliations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shane White</td>
<td>Professor; Senate Chair, 2020–21</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Kreiman</td>
<td>Professor In-Residence; Senate Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, 2020–21</td>
<td>Linguistics; Head &amp; Neck Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Meranze</td>
<td>Professor; Senate Immediate Past Chair, 2020–21</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisy Abrego</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Chicana/o and Central American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Akee</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Public Policy; American Indian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosina Becerra</td>
<td>Professor Emerita</td>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Behdad</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Bendersky</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bisley</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Neurobiology; Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Brandenberg</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Civil and Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Bristow</td>
<td>Professor; Senate Chair, 2018–19</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Bui</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Radiological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve Carpio</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Chicana/o and Central American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Cattelino</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Chang</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Education; Asian American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King-Kok Cheung</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>English; Asian American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Colwell</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Dunkel Schetter</td>
<td>Professor; Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Development</td>
<td>Psychology; Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishuana Goeman</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Gender Studies; American Indian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Goldberg</td>
<td>Professor Emerita; Senate Chair, 1993–94</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Kamei</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Keyes</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Ethnomusicology and Global Jazz Studies; African American Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to faculty interviews, the following individuals were consulted:

- Kyndra Cleveland, Research Scientist, UCLA Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director, UC Riverside Academic Senate
- April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
- Johnathan Perkins, Special Assistant to the UCLA Vice Chancellor of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- Letty Trevino, UCLA Graduate Student Association (GSA) Vice President for Academic Affairs
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Items are ordered chronologically.

The Moreno Recommendations Implementation Committee (MRIC) was created to monitor and assess UCLA’s activities, progress, and challenges regarding implementation of the Moreno Committee recommendations. MRIC provided detailed information to assist the Chancellor, the EVC/P, Senior Leadership and the wider community develop a comprehensive approach to faculty equity, diversity and inclusion at UCLA. The MRIC Report documents areas of success and challenge, offers ideas for consideration, evidence of "Promising Practices and Initiatives," and recommendations for continued progress towards achieving Inclusive Excellence at UCLA. Our recommendations are based on analysis of the University faculty landscape, institutional practices, and the narratives of Black and Latina Faculty.
UC Academic Council, “Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty” (January 26, 2021)
https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/mg-md-mitigating-covid-impacts-on-faculty.pdf

Recommendations for mitigating COVID-19 impacts on faculty advancement, morale, work-life balance, and dependent care responsibilities. The recommendations outline both immediate actions the University can take to support faculty, and also longer-term systemic changes to better support equity, inclusion, recruitment, and retention.

UCLA Faculty Service Ad Hoc Task Force, “UCLA Faculty Service Report” (Fall 2020)
This report provides some solutions to the problem of inequity in service among faculty and develops strategies to reward or compensate those doing more.


Although diversity training is commonplace in organizations, the relative scarcity of field experiments testing its effectiveness leaves ambiguity about whether diversity training improves attitudes and behaviors toward women and racial minorities. We present results from a large (n = 3,016) field experiment at a global organization testing whether a brief science-based online diversity training can change attitudes and behaviors toward women in the workplace. Our preregistered field experiment included an active placebo control and measured participants’ attitudes and real workplace decisions up to 20 weeks postintervention. Among groups whose average untreated attitudes—whereas still supportive of women—were relatively less supportive of women than other groups, our diversity training successfully produced attitude change but not behavior change. On the other hand, our diversity training successfully generated some behavior change among groups whose average untreated attitudes were already strongly supportive of women before training. This paper extends our knowledge about the pathways to attitude and behavior change in the context of bias reduction. However, the results suggest that the one-off diversity trainings that are commonplace in organizations are unlikely to be stand-alone solutions for promoting equality in the workplace, particularly given their limited efficacy among those groups whose behaviors policymakers are most eager to influence.

MEGAP Workgroup, “Mentoring and Evaluation of Graduate Academic Progress (MEGAP) Workgroup Report to Graduate Council” (October 12, 2018; corrected May 3, 2019)
In 2016-2017, the Mentoring and Evaluation of Graduate Academic Progress (MEGAP) workgroup was co-charged by the UCLA Graduate Council and UCLA Graduate Division to address the evaluation of graduate student academic progress and the role of mentoring in enhancing student experiences and success. MEGAP’s charge was to develop recommendations, best practices, and tools that departments can use to apply the principles articulated in the UCLA Graduate Student Academic Rights and Responsibilities statement.

Joint Senate-Administration Faculty Salary Equity Committee, “Senate Faculty Salary Equity Study and Recommendations” (February 2016, February 22, 2017) https://www.apo.ucla.edu/compensation/ucla-faculty-salary-equity-studies
This study focused on analyzing salary data as of July 1, 2013, by gender and race/ethnicity; equity adjustments since that time are not reflected in the report.

We seek to help solve the puzzle of why top-level leaders are disproportionately White men. We suggest that this race- and sex-based status and power gap persists, in part, because ethnic minority and female leaders are discouraged from engaging in diversity-valuing behavior. We hypothesize, and test in both field and laboratory samples, that ethnic minority or female leaders who engage in diversity-valuing behavior are penalized with worse performance ratings, whereas White or male leaders who engage in diversity-valuing behavior are not penalized for doing so. We find that this divergent effect results from traditional negative race and sex stereotypes (i.e., lower competence judgments) placed upon diversity-valuing ethnic minority and female leaders. We discuss how our findings extend and enrich the vast literatures on the glass ceiling, tokenism, and workplace discrimination.


This report addresses themes in diversity-related issues raised in department program review reports from 2008-09 through 2012-13 and the effectiveness of the review process as a vehicle for impacting equity, diversity and inclusion at the departmental level.


Moreno Committee, “Independent Investigative Report on Acts of Bias and Discrimination Involving Faculty at the University of California, Los Angeles (Moreno Report)” (October 15, 2013)

This report is the culmination of several months of investigation regarding the university’s policies, procedures, and mechanisms for responding to incidents of perceived bias, discrimination, and intolerance at UCLA involving faculty of color—including in hiring and advancement decisions. We conclude that UCLA’s policies and procedures for responding to incidents of perceived bias, discrimination and intolerance involving faculty are inadequate. The university administration must work to find solutions to this problem.


We developed a multi-faceted prejudice habit-breaking intervention to produce long-term reductions in implicit race bias. The intervention is based on the premise that implicit bias is like a habit that can be broken through a combination of awareness of implicit bias, concern about the effects of that bias, and the application of strategies to reduce bias. In a 12-week longitudinal study, people who received the intervention showed dramatic reductions in implicit race bias. People who were concerned about discrimination or who reported using the strategies showed the greatest reductions. The intervention also led to increases in concern about discrimination and personal awareness of bias over the duration of the study. People in the control group showed none of the above effects. Our results raise the hope of reducing persistent and unintentional forms of discrimination that arise from implicit bias.
Appendix 3: UCLA and UC Implicit Bias Trainings

UC/CSU Moving Beyond Bias [https://movingbeyondbias.org](https://movingbeyondbias.org)

Moving Beyond Bias is a learning program that explores how bias works, and how we can reduce its harmful effects on CSU and UC campuses. Participants:

- Examine personal biases and learn how they can influence behavior and decision-making in academic contexts
- See the connection between social group biases (whether positive or negative) and their potential impact on university policies, procedures and outcomes
- Are introduced to strategies to equip participants to both recognize and disrupt attitudes and practices that are rooted in bias
- Practice the mindful use of tools and strategies to disrupt bias

The 2018 California Budget Act included a one-time appropriation of $1.2 million for a two-year pilot program “to provide anti-bias training for administrators, faculty, staff, and student leaders at campuses of the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU).” A joint UC-CSU workgroup of content experts was formed — including scholars and practitioners of anti-bias and implicit bias training — to define the scope and learning outcomes of an evidence-based program appropriate for different university populations. This workgroup issued a Request for Proposals (RFP), inviting vendors to demonstrate their training modules and address questions. In June 2019, after a comprehensive review of all proposals, the UC-CSU workgroup selected Just Communities of Central Coast and Dr. Carmel Saad to deliver the pilot training program. This training is modeled after Dr. Patricia Devine’s Breaking the Bias Habit framework, which approaches bias as a natural thought-habit that can be disrupted with awareness, concern and practice.

UCLA Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion’s Seven-Part Video Series on Implicit Bias for Faculty Search Committees [https://equity.ucla.edu/programs-resources/faculty-search-process/faculty-search-committee-resources](https://equity.ucla.edu/programs-resources/faculty-search-process/faculty-search-committee-resources)

Since 2016, faculty search briefings have had two primary components: (1) a seven-part animated video series on implicit bias (roughly 30 minutes total, to be viewed on your own time before the briefing); (2) on in-class training that explores evidence-based tools and techniques to promote equitable and inclusive hiring.

1. Preface: Biases and Heuristics (5:13)
2. Lesson 1: Schemas (3:12)
3. Lesson 2: Attitudes and Stereotypes (4:13)
4. Lesson 3: Real World Consequences (3:45)
5. Lesson 4: Explicit v. Implicit Bias (2:49)
6. Lesson 5: The IAT (5:14)
7. Lesson 6: Countermeasures (5:23)

UC Implicit Bias Modules for UC Employees [https://equity.ucla.edu/know/implicit-bias](https://equity.ucla.edu/know/implicit-bias)

*Modules (20-30 minutes each) are hosted on the UC Learning Center:*

1. What Is Implicit Bias
2. The Impact of Implicit Bias
3. Managing the Influence of Implicit Bias
4. Awareness
5. Common Forms of Bias
6. Managing the Influence of Implicit Bias: Mindfulness And Conscious De-Biasing
7. Managing Implicit Bias In the Hiring Process

### Appendix 4: Academic Senate Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Members</th>
<th>Non Senate Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor In Residence</td>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Clinical “X”</td>
<td>Clinical Professor* (compensated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Professor</td>
<td>Adjunct Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Visiting Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor In Residence</td>
<td>Associate Clinical Professor* (compensated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor of Clinical “X”</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Associate Professor</td>
<td>Acting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Professor (In Residence)</td>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor (compensated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor in Residence</td>
<td>Lecturers without Security of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor of Clinical “X”</td>
<td>Visiting Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Adjunct Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor In Residence</td>
<td>Associate Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer with Security of Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Lecturer with Security of Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Vice Chancellors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University Librarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Emeriti who held any of the above titles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[http://senate.ucla.edu/about/senate-service#academic-senate-membership](http://senate.ucla.edu/about/senate-service#academic-senate-membership)