

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Martha Kendall Winnacker, J.D.
Telephone: (510) 987-9458
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: martha.winnacker@ucop.edu

Executive Director
Universitywide Academic Senate
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

April 16, 2012

CHAIRS OF SENATE DIVISIONS
CHAIRS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Dear Division and Committee Chairs:

On behalf of Academic Council Chair Bob Anderson I am forwarding for full Senate review the report of the joint Faculty Diversity Faculty Diversity Working Group, one of five groups created by President Yudof to support the President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture, and Inclusion.

The report recommends 11 "promising practices" for fostering a diverse faculty and makes distinct proposals for systemwide and local implementation. Please address your comments to the individual recommendations, but do not feel obligated to comment on every recommendation if you consider one or more to fall outside your committee's jurisdiction. Comments that predict the consequences of adopting a recommendation or that explain how adoption of a recommendation would change or confirm existing practices in specific divisions should be as detailed as possible.

Although the Provost has requested comment by June 11, the Senate leadership has determined that it is not possible for all relevant Senate bodies to opine by that date. Accordingly, your comments are requested by **June 20** in order to allow discussion at the June 27 meeting of the Academic Council. As always, every committee is invited to opine on this report, but no committee is obligated to do so if the committee considers the report to be outside the scope of its charge.

Sincerely,

Martha Kendall Winnacker, J.D.
Executive Director, Academic Senate

Encl. (1)

Cc: Division directors
Committee analysts



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT --
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

April 12, 2012

EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLORS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR ANDERSON

Dear Colleagues:

I am transmitting for your review and comment the recommendation report issued by the Faculty Diversity Working Group, one of five groups created by President Yudof to support the President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture, and Inclusion.

The purpose of the Faculty Diversity Working Group was to report to the Council and recommend measures of progress, mechanisms for accountability, and advice regarding best practices on issues related to faculty hiring, contributions to equity and diversity, and administrative structures and accountability.

Please review the report, in particular, the priorities and suggestions about what should be a campus responsibility and what might be best accomplished systemwide. I would appreciate receiving your comments, which should be submitted by June 11, 2012, to Susan.Carlson@UCOP.edu.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lawrence H. Pitts".

Lawrence H. Pitts
Provost and Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs

Attachment

cc: President Yudof
Special Advisor Edley
Vice Provost Carlson
Diversity Coordinator Bernal

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CAMPUS CLIMATE, CULTURE, AND INCLUSION
Faculty Diversity Working Group
BRIEFING PAPER: PROMISING PRACTICES FOR FACULTY DIVERSITY**

The Faculty Diversity Working Group was one of five groups created by President Yudof in December 2010. The purpose of the Group was to report to the Council and "recommend measures of progress, mechanisms for accountability, and advice regarding best practices" on issues related to faculty hiring, contributions to equity and diversity, and administrative structures and accountability.

One of the Working Group's initial premises was that there continues to exist a pressing need to diversify the UC faculty with regard to women and individuals from historically underrepresented minority (URM) communities. The University's ability to fulfill that need becomes even more pressing in the current budgetary environment.

Importance of Faculty Diversity for Campus Climate: *The Working Group's hypothesis that there is a strong correlation between the presence of women and URM faculty and a positive campus climate was informed by contemporary research on climate issues. For example, UCLA professor Daniel Solórzano and his colleagues write: "Faculty and administration who are open and responsive to concerns of people of color and other marginalized groups help define and create a healthy climate."¹ Moreover, the scholarly literature finds that "students engage with race and ethnicity not just in the curriculum but also through the people whom they encounter during college... Interactions with faculty and administrators of a different race or ethnicity may be particularly important in securing the advantages of diversity."² Structural diversity among faculty, or the number of diverse faculty, has an influence on a campus's institutional climate because of faculty's ability to influence the campus environment over time.*

The Faculty Diversity Working Group provides eleven practices and recommendations for review and discussion by the President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture, & Inclusion and the local campus climate councils. The Working Group considers these findings relevant not only for racial and ethnic groups, but also for gender, sexuality, and religion-based identities.

Systemwide-Level Best Practices and Recommendations

Practice #1: Fully Implement Academic Personnel Policy Section 210 (APM – 210), Review and Appraisal Committees

Remind each campus that APM 210 was approved by the entire Senate and charge each campus to devise strategies for the implementation of APM 210 as criteria for appointment and promotion of faculty. The implementation process may take different forms at the various micro-levels of division, school, or department.

¹ W. Smith, T. Yosso, and D. Solórzano, "Racial Primes and Black Misandry on Historically White Campuses: Toward Critical Race Accountability in Educational Administration," *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43 (2007).

² Thomas J. Espenshade and Alexandria Walton Radford, *No Longer Separate, Not yet Equal: Race and Class in Elite College Admission and Campus Life* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009), 181.

Practice #2: Provide Training for Members of COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL/Budget Committees

The Working Group recommends that training be developed regarding evaluating faculty contributions to diversity.

Practice #3: Accountability Reports on Diversity of Key Senate Committee Compositions

The Working Group recommends making available to appropriate Senate committees on each campus accountability reports, prepared by this Working Group, that identify URM and gender composition of Budget/Academic Personnel committees over a five year period. Also, continue the collection of faculty search data (candidate pool and finalist demographics and search committee make-up) after this initial year.

Practice #4: Selection and Review of Provosts, Deans and Chairs and Annual Reports

The Working Group recommends integrating diversity and equity issues into the criteria for selection, appointment, reviews, and promotion of Provosts and Deans or Chairs. We recommend that UCOP require Annual Reports from the Chancellors on diversity and equity progress in these senior management positions. Additionally, we recommend that Provosts, Deans, and Department Chairs submit Annual Reports to the Chancellor to describe diversity and equity activities and progress.

Practice #5: Funding for a Reward Pool of FTE

The Working Group recommends established funding for a reward pool for campuses making noteworthy progress on faculty diversity issues.

Practice #6: President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program

The President's Postdoctoral Fellowship program is one of the most successful programs for diversifying the faculty. Funding should be restored for this program as well as the UC Diversity Pipeline Initiative for the Health Sciences.

Practice #7: Update the UCOP 2002 Affirmative Action Guidelines for the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Brochure

The Working Group recommends that Academic Personnel update this communication tool to include the following among other items: 1) UC Diversity Statement (2007, Regents), 2) Diversity activities relevant for the appointment and promotion of faculty in (APM 210) of Deans (APM 240), and of Chairs (APM 245), 3) Implementation methods and evaluation methods for diversity activities in APM 210, 240, and 245.

Campus-Level Practices

Practice #8: Crediting Contributions to Diversity

Encourage the adoption at each campus of a hybrid approach to the reporting of contributions to diversity. First, each file will catalogue relevant activities in the three basic areas of research, teaching, and service (the so-called integrative method), with contributions to diversity flagged by a double asterisk. Secondly, each bio-bib form and/or candidate's statement will include a diversity narrative

box in which faculty members highlight diversity efforts, drawing from the activities in the three areas of responsibility (stand-alone method). This combination of the two methods for identifying contributions to diversity will be referred to as the "hybrid" method.

Practice #9: One-time half or whole step increase for extraordinary contributions to diversity

Allow for awarding a one-time half or whole step increase for exceptional service related to diversity and equity activities.

Practice #10: Central Diversity Office

Each campus would consider establishing a central Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion with appropriate staffing and resources at each campus, with direct access to the Chancellor and Budget Committee.

Practice #11: Cluster Hiring

Encourage "cluster hiring" of URM and female faculty in areas where they are below the national eligibility pool.

Working Group Membership

Convener: Susan Carlson, Vice Provost-Academic Personnel (UCOP)
Convener: George "Jorge" Mariscal, Professor of Literature (UCSD)
Robert Anderson, Professor of Economics and Mathematics (UCB), & Chair, Academic Council
Ines Boechat, Professor of Radiological Sciences (UCLA)
Margaret Conkey, Professor Emerita of Anthropology (UCB)
Tyrone Howard, Professor of Education (UCLA)
Herbie Lee, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs & Chief Diversity Officer for Faculty (UCSC)
Francis Lu, Professor of Clinical Psychiatry (UCD) & Chair, Universitywide Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity
Manuela Martins-Green, Professor of Cell Biology (UCR) & Chair, UCR Affirmative Action & Diversity Committee
Teenie Matlock, Professor of Cognitive Science (UCM)
Dave Stark, Director-Stiles Hall (UCB)
Staff: Janet Lockwood, Academic Personnel (UCOP)

DISCUSSION OF PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE SYSTEMWIDE-LEVEL

Practice #1: Implement Academic Personnel Policy Section 210 (APM – 210), Review and Appraisal Committees

Campus climate is directly affected by the faculty's willingness to engage in activities that improve conditions for URM, women, LGBT, and other groups. APM 210 (implemented in 2005) is the mechanism for ensuring that faculty members receive recognition for their efforts. APM 210 states: "The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Teaching, research, and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms."

The Working Group understands the importance of the campus affirmative action plan mandated by the Federal government. Data on faculty underutilization will be an important factor for the articulation of diversity and equity goals. In what follows below, however, we focus on new and innovative approaches designed to generate such goals by analyzing in depth current needs in the local context.

The Working Group's research has yielded the following innovative best practices for the implementation of APM 210:

- Once a general campus diversity and equity strategic plan is adopted, each school/division and academic department adapts elements for its own plan
- School/Division and/or academic department articulates specific diversity needs and goals based on 1) campus strategic plans, 2) consultation with stakeholders in each unit, and 3) affirmative action plans. School/Division and/or academic department creates a template of specific equity and diversity activities relevant to APM 210 to help achieve faculty-related equity and diversity goals (Document authored by Sheila O'Rourke could serve as model-template).
- One specific Working Group suggestion is that in an ideal scenario off-campus activities would be linked to impact on campus climate. How does a department's tutoring program at a local high school, for example, encourage department faculty to rethink its research priorities and/or the composition of its faculty? Consider off-campus activities in dialectical relationship to transformation of on-campus climate.
- Equity advisors check in with tenure and promotion candidates re: credit for diversity work
- Deans/Provosts deliver annual public town meetings on progress on diversity issues and plans for the coming year
- Development officers/fundraising staff (both divisional and general campus) prepare annual reports on progress related to diversity and equity programs and initiatives
- External reviews of departments/programs include section on diversity
- Chair of Academic Senate Committee on Diversity-Equity of each campus sits on Senate Executive Council of that campus
- Include Department Chairs in APM-210 Implementation communications strategy

Practice #2: Provide Training for Members of COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL/Budget Committees

This training should not be confused with anti-bias training already provided for Committee on Academic Personnel/Budget committee members. Despite campus reports that APM 210 is being implemented, there is abundant anecdotal evidence that the ability of campus evaluators to judge contributions to diversity is spread unevenly across the system. In many cases, evaluators state either that they are not sure what constitutes a contribution to diversity or that they do not know how contributions should be factored into reviews or both.

The Working Group sees three possible options for training on how to identify and assess contributions to diversity would be accomplished: 1) web-based training similar to programs for sexual harassment, 2) regional (North/South) training sessions, 3) campus administrators

responsible for faculty diversity offer mandatory workshops. The second option might be the best given that it will bring together faculty from different campuses, thereby breaking the silo effect and generating productive cross-campus dialogue about best practices. UCLA is conducting a workshop/training session for Committee on Academic Personnel for the first time in Fall 2011. Other colleagues in the system who are well equipped to assist in the development of a training program include Sheila O'Rourke, Ines Boechat (UCLA), Francis Lu (UCD), Manuela Martins-Green (UCR), and Ross Frank (UCSD).

Practice #3: Accountability Reports on Diversity of Key Senate Committee Compositions

Data compiled by the Working Group indicate that membership on key Academic Senate committees, e.g. Committees on Academic Personnel, Budget, Planning and Budget across the UC system continues to be white and male (see attachment). Although these percentages mirror the overall composition of UC faculty, if UC hopes to advance goals of greater inclusion and diversity it should be proactive by creating bodies whose composition reflect where UC wants to be – more diverse – particularly if diversity and equity issues are to be in the foreground of personnel decisions. This is especially true during difficult budgetary times.

The Working Group recommends making available to appropriate Senate committees on each campus accountability reports, prepared by this Working Group, that identify URM and gender composition of Budget/Academic Personnel committees over a five year period. Also, continue the collection of faculty search data (candidate pool and finalist demographics and search committee make-up) after this initial year. Data should be gathered annually by and reported on a regular basis to Academic Senate Leadership, campus administrative leadership, and the President/Provost. It is important that campus officials responsible for gathering and interpreting data understand that the combining of URM and international faculty numbers produces a distorted picture of the University's progress on the hiring of URM faculty.

Practice #4: Selection and Review of Provosts, Deans and Chairs and Annual Reports

Ensure that diversity and equity activities are integral to the search, selection, and review process. The Working Group recommends that Provosts, Deans, and Department Chairs submit Annual reports to the Chancellor describing their activities and progress. This is to ensure that these academic leaders will be both incentivized and held accountable for promoting equity and diversity activities in their unit.

As a UC Irvine document puts it: "Establishing agreed upon guidelines at each level on how to consider and evaluate diversity and affirmative action efforts during the performance review process is a first step needed to enable individual accountability. This must involve all those who contribute to performance review: Academic Senate committees, departments and department chairs, deans and Academic Personnel administrators" (<http://paid.uci.edu/APM%20Summary.pdf>).

The Working Group recommends that a formal annual report be delivered from Chairs to Deans, Deans to Provost/Vice Chancellor, Provost/Vice Chancellor to Chancellor, and Chancellor to the President/Provost about progress in diversity and equity at all levels. As is the case with Academic Senate committee membership, it is important that campus officials responsible for gathering and interpreting data understand that the combining of URM and international faculty

numbers produces a distorted picture of the University's progress on the hiring of URM faculty.

Practice #5: Funding for a Reward Pool of FTE

The Working Group believes strongly in the need for financial incentives and rewards for hiring under-represented tenure-track faculty. While we understand that changes in University revenues and funding structures complicate central funding of such a pool, we recommend that the President work with the Chancellors to determine the best way to reward progress in diversifying the faculty. Options include fund-raising for endowments that support specific programs or research or tying budget allocations to those units that can demonstrate progress in recruitment and retention of under-represented tenure track faculty. We recommend that campuses put together indicator data on hires, promotions, and leadership appointments as a part of the competition for these allocations. Since hiring practices have resulted in only incremental progress in the diversity of the faculty over the last decade, we need to invoke a more prominent system to reward success.

Practice #6: President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program

Since 2003, 90 President's Postdoctoral Fellowship participants have been hired into UC faculty position and as of May 2011, 21 were tenured. Funding has been cut 62% since 2008 and is slated for an additional 20% cut in 2011-12. There are currently 15 new fellows and 13 continuing compared to 42 in 2008.

There is a strong consensus that the program is one of the most effective for populating the URM faculty pipeline. We recommend that its funding be increased to support between 35 and 40 fellowships at a cost of \$65,000 per year in order to maximize the program. We also recommend that some funding be provided for the UC Diversity Pipeline Initiative for graduate women of color in the Health Sciences; total cost is \$45,000 annually.

Practice #7: Update the UCOP 2002 Affirmative Action Guidelines for the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Brochure

Update the UCOP 2002 Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Brochure to include the following among other items: a) UC Diversity Statement (2007, Regents), b) Diversity activities relevant for the appointment and promotion of faculty in language of (APM 210), of Deans (APM 240), and of Chairs (APM 245), c) Implementation methods and evaluation methods for diversity activities in APM 210, 240, and 245.

DISCUSSION OF PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LOCAL CLIMATE COUNCILS

Practice #8: Crediting Contributions to Diversity

Encourage the adoption at each campus of a "hybrid" approach to the reporting of contributions to equity and diversity. In addition to cataloging relevant activities in the three basic sections of research, teaching, and service (the so-called integrative method), the bio-bib form would include a separate breakout box listing diversity contributions. This hybrid approach to the reporting of contributions to diversity would facilitate the identification of relevant activities for Committee on Academic Personnel/Budget committees and other reviewers and is especially

useful during this transitional period when campus reviewers are becoming accustomed to evaluating diversity and equity activities.

Best practices on campuses that already support this include 1) at least one formal annual conversation between the Committee on Academic Personnel chair and the Campus Diversity committee about APM 210 evaluation, 2) training on implicit bias for Committee on Academic Personnel members to reduce bias in the appointment and promotion process, and 3) equity advisors meet with tenure and promotion candidates to discuss equity and diversity activities.

Campuses might also consider implementing an annual Senate award for "Outstanding Contributions to Diversity and Equity." UCB and UCLA currently have such awards.

Practice #9: One-time half or whole step increase for extraordinary contributions to diversity

This practice has been instituted at some UC campuses, most notably UC Berkeley. In order to stress the importance of faculty work related to equity and diversity issues on campus, Committee on Academic Personnel/Budget committees should consider instituting a reward system comparable to those in place for serving as department chair.

Practice #10: Central Diversity Office

In the past, campuses have been allowed a great deal of flexibility with regard to the establishment of a diversity infrastructure. In too many cases, a weak infrastructure has produced a campus climate that specific groups continue to view as inhospitable. The practice that allows a campus to disperse its climate initiatives across numerous units rather than through a central office may have run its course. The traditional approach that argues "We don't want diversity to be isolated in one location; we want everyone to be doing it" has been in effect for some four decades and positive outcomes for favorable campus climate and diversity have been minimal.

Rather than approaching this issue with the question "What will make diversity work more easily?" we suggest the question "What will make diversity-related work more effective?" at every level of the institution. The approach that currently appears to be the most effective is a central Vice Chancellor position that has the authority and resources to serve as a clearing-house for all climate and diversity-related activities. In the UC system, the so-called Berkeley model has produced the best results to date.³ While we do not propose the direct importation of that model to other campuses, we believe that model to be an extremely useful precedent/model/template that other campuses might adapt to local conditions and goals. We understand that the Working Group on structure is focused on this issue as well.

Practice #11: Cluster Hiring

Although the current budgetary climate makes it difficult, the practice of hiring small groups of faculty conducting research on topics related to underrepresented minority communities should

³ In addition to the Berkeley model, there are other important precedents. See, for example, the outstanding "Framework for Diversity" document (2004) authored by UC Riverside Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Diversity and Excellence Dr. Yolanda Moses.

be given the highest priority as soon as it is financially possible. As a leading scholar in campus climate research, UCLA Professor Sylvia Hurtado has noted "The presence of a critical mass of underrepresented minority faculty often helps attract and retain new underrepresented minority faculty."⁴ In his report to President Yudof (April 7, 2010), Dean Chris Edley argued that the UC San Diego plan for diversifying its faculty was "poorly designed" because it was a "department driven process of stove-piped searches which have an unacceptable risk of failure given how limited and competitive applicant pools will be... There are alternative strategies and alternative ways of building a critical mass of diverse scholars."⁵

We recommend that the Working Group reconvene one year from now to survey the state of each campus with regard to the twelve areas discussed in this report. While we expect that there will be uneven progress across the system, an assessment of current practices in Fall of 2012 will be a useful tool for faculty and administrators engaged on the issue of faculty diversity and equity.

Attachment: Summary of Ethnicity and Gender of University Committee on Academic Personnel (UC Committee on Academic Personnel) & Ethnicity and Gender of University Committee on Planning and Budget (UC Committee on Planning and Budget) Members, 2006-07 through 2010-11

⁴ Study Group on University Diversity-Campus Climate Report,
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/documents/07-campus_report.pdf

⁵ Dean Christopher Edley, *Report on UC San Diego* (April 2010). Distributed with materials for the June 30, 2010 meeting of the President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion (Appendix 8).

UC Senate Committee: CAP (Committee on Academic Personnel)
Ethnicity of CAP Members, 2006-07 through 2010-11

<u>Universitywide</u>	<u>Number</u>					<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>					<u>Total</u>
	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>		<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	
AS	12	7	8	11	17	55	11.1%	5.7%	7.8%	10.0%	15.6%	10.0%
BL	1	1	1	4	2	9	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	3.6%	1.8%	1.6%
HI	4	7	4	5	6	26	3.7%	5.7%	3.9%	4.5%	5.5%	4.7%
IN	1	1				2	0.9%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
WH	90	106	90	90	84	460	83.3%	86.9%	87.4%	81.8%	77.1%	83.3%
Total	108	122	103	110	109	552	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

UCOP Academic Personnel, 4-27-2011.

UC Senate Committee: CAP (Committee on Academic Personnel)
Ethnicity of CAP Members, By Campus, 2006-07 through 2010-11

Campus	CAP Members		All Ladder Rank Faculty		Expected Number of Minority CAP Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)*
	Total CAP Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)	% Minorities of CAP Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)	Headcount (Fall 2009)	% Minorities (Fall 2009)	
Berkeley					
AS	6	11.5%	163	12.1%	6
BL	2	3.8%	40	3.0%	2
HI	0	0.0%	65	4.8%	2
IN	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0
WH	44	84.6%	1,075	80.0%	42
Total	52	100.0%	1,344	100.0%	52
Davis					
AS	8	17.0%	207	14.6%	7
BL	0	0.0%	26	1.8%	1
HI	0	0.0%	59	4.2%	2
IN	2	4.3%	8	0.6%	0
WH	37	78.7%	1,119	78.8%	37
Total	47	100.0%	1,419	100.0%	47
Irvine					
AS	5	8.8%	204	19.4%	11
BL	0	0.0%	23	2.2%	1
HI	1	1.8%	61	5.8%	3
IN	0	0.0%	3	0.3%	0
WH	51	89.5%	758	72.3%	41
Total	57	100.0%	1,049	100.0%	57
Los Angeles					
AS	4	5.6%	270	15.2%	11
BL	1	1.4%	58	3.3%	2
HI	1	1.4%	106	6.0%	4
IN	0	0.0%	8	0.5%	0
WH	66	91.7%	1,332	75.1%	54
Total	72	100.0%	1,774	100.0%	72
Merced					
AS	7	13.2%	24	20.7%	11
BL	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	0
HI	7	13.2%	16	13.8%	7
IN	0	0.0%	2	1.7%	1
WH	39	73.6%	73	62.9%	33
Total	53	100.0%	116	100.0%	53
Riverside					
AS	4	7.8%	129	20.6%	11
BL	2	3.9%	23	3.7%	2
HI	0	0.0%	37	5.9%	3
IN	0	0.0%	4	0.6%	0
WH	45	88.2%	433	69.2%	35
Total	51	100.0%	626	100.0%	51

UC Senate Committee: CAP (Committee on Academic Personnel)
Ethnicity of CAP Members, By Campus, 2006-07 through 2010-11

Campus	CAP Members		All Ladder Rank Faculty		Expected Number of Minority CAP Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)*
	Total CAP Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)	% Minorities of CAP Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)	Headcount (Fall 2009)	% Minorities (Fall 2009)	
San Diego					
AS	8	12.3%	179	16.3%	11
BL	0	0.0%	22	2.0%	1
HI	6	9.2%	57	5.2%	3
IN	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0
WH	51	78.5%	841	76.5%	50
Total	65	100.0%	1,100	100.0%	65
San Francisco					
AS	2	4.2%	32	9.5%	5
BL	2	4.2%	8	2.4%	1
HI	2	4.2%	11	3.3%	2
IN	0	0.0%	2	0.6%	0
WH	42	87.5%	285	84.3%	40
Total	48	100.0%	338	100.0%	48
Santa Barbara					
AS	3	4.9%	79	9.8%	6
BL	2	3.3%	18	2.2%	1
HI	4	6.6%	47	5.9%	4
IN	0	0.0%	4	0.5%	0
WH	52	85.2%	655	81.6%	50
Total	61	100.0%	803	100.0%	61
Santa Cruz					
AS	8	17.4%	65	13.3%	6
BL	0	0.0%	15	3.1%	1
HI	5	10.9%	39	8.0%	4
IN	0	0.0%	9	1.8%	1
WH	33	71.7%	361	73.8%	34
Total	46	100.0%	489	100.0%	46

*Calculation was based on % ladder rank minorities (Fall 2009) times total CAP members last 5 years at each campus.

UCOP Academic Personnel, 5-6-2011.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Full-Time Ladder Rank Faculty
2009

	<u>U-WIDE</u>	<u>UCB</u>	<u>UCD</u>	<u>UCI</u>	<u>UCLA</u>	<u>UCM</u>	<u>UCR</u>	<u>UCSB</u>	<u>UCSC</u>	<u>UCSD</u>	<u>UCSF</u>
AmInd	42	1	8	3	8	2	4	4	9	1	2
AfrAm	234	40	26	23	58	1	23	18	15	22	8
Chic/Lat	498	65	59	61	106	16	37	47	39	57	11
Asian	1,352	163	207	204	270	24	129	79	65	179	32
White	6,871	1,059	1,107	753	1,328	73	430	636	360	840	285
Non-Resident Alien	61	16	12	5	4	0	3	19	1	1	0
TOTAL	9,058	1,344	1,419	1,049	1,774	116	626	803	489	1,100	338
AmInd	0.50%	0.10%	0.60%	0.30%	0.50%	1.70%	0.60%	0.50%	1.80%	0.10%	0.60%
AfrAm	2.60%	3.00%	1.80%	2.20%	3.30%	0.90%	3.70%	2.20%	3.10%	2.00%	2.40%
Chic/Lat	5.50%	4.80%	4.20%	5.80%	6.00%	13.80%	5.90%	5.90%	8.00%	5.20%	3.30%
Asian	14.90%	12.10%	14.60%	19.40%	15.20%	20.70%	20.60%	9.80%	13.30%	16.30%	9.50%
White	75.90%	78.80%	78.00%	71.80%	74.90%	62.90%	68.70%	79.20%	73.60%	76.40%	84.30%
Non-Resident Alien	0.70%	1.20%	0.80%	0.50%	0.20%	0.00%	0.50%	2.40%	0.20%	0.10%	0.00%
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Source: IPEDS Fall Staff Survey

UC Senate Committee: CPB (Committee on Planning and Budget)
Ethnicity of CPB Members, 2006-07 through 2010-11

<u>Universitywide</u>	<u>Number</u>					<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>					<u>Total</u>
	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>		<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	
AS	10	8	9	11	13	51	9.0%	7.6%	8.7%	10.3%	11.3%	9.4%
BL		1	1	1	1	4	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.7%
HI	3	5	5	5	2	20	2.7%	4.8%	4.9%	4.7%	1.7%	3.7%
WH	98	91	88	90	99	466	88.3%	86.7%	85.4%	84.1%	86.1%	86.1%
Total	111	105	103	107	115	541	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

UCOP Academic Personnel, 4-27-2011.

UC Senate Committee: CPB (Committee on Planning and Budget)
Ethnicity of CPB Members, By Campus, 2006-07 through 2010-11

Campus	CPB Members		All Ladder Rank Faculty		Expected Number of Minority CPB Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)*
	Total CPB Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)	% Minorities of CPB Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)	Headcount (Fall 2009)	% Minorities (Fall 2009)	
Berkeley					
AS	3	4.5%	163	12.1%	8
BL	0	0.0%	40	3.0%	2
HI	0	0.0%	65	4.8%	3
IN	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0
WH	64	95.5%	1,075	80.0%	54
Total	67	100.0%	1,344	100.0%	67
Davis					
AS	5	10.9%	207	14.6%	7
BL	1	2.2%	26	1.8%	1
HI	0	0.0%	59	4.2%	2
IN	0	0.0%	8	0.6%	0
WH	40	87.0%	1,119	78.8%	36
Total	46	100.0%	1,419	100.0%	46
Irvine					
AS	1	2.0%	204	19.4%	10
BL	0	0.0%	23	2.2%	1
HI	2	4.1%	61	5.8%	3
IN	0	0.0%	3	0.3%	0
WH	46	93.9%	758	72.3%	35
Total	49	100.0%	1,049	100.0%	49
Los Angeles					
AS	9	11.1%	270	15.2%	12
BL	2	2.5%	58	3.3%	3
HI	10	12.3%	106	6.0%	5
IN	0	0.0%	8	0.5%	0
WH	60	74.1%	1,332	75.1%	61
Total	81	100.0%	1,774	100.0%	81
Merced					
AS	0	0.0%	24	20.7%	5
BL	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	0
HI	1	4.0%	16	13.8%	3
IN	0	0.0%	2	1.7%	0
WH	24	96.0%	73	62.9%	16
Total	25	100.0%	116	100.0%	25
Riverside					
AS	13	31.7%	129	20.6%	8
BL	0	0.0%	23	3.7%	2
HI	1	2.4%	37	5.9%	2
IN	0	0.0%	4	0.6%	0
WH	27	65.9%	433	69.2%	28
Total	41	100.0%	626	100.0%	41

UC Senate Committee: CPB (Committee on Planning and Budget)
Ethnicity of CPB Members, By Campus, 2006-07 through 2010-11

Campus	CPB Members		All Ladder Rank Faculty		Expected Number of Minority CPB Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)*
	Total CPB Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)	% Minorities of CPB Members Last 5 Years (2006-07 through 2010-11)	Headcount (Fall 2009)	% Minorities (Fall 2009)	
San Diego					
AS	0	0.0%	179	16.3%	2
BL	0	0.0%	22	2.0%	0
HI	0	0.0%	57	5.2%	1
IN	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0
WH	15	100.0%	841	76.5%	11
Total	15	100.0%	1,100	100.0%	15
San Francisco					
AS	14	14.6%	32	9.5%	9
BL	0	0.0%	8	2.4%	2
HI	0	0.0%	11	3.3%	3
IN	0	0.0%	2	0.6%	1
WH	82	85.4%	285	84.3%	81
Total	96	100.0%	338	100.0%	96
Santa Barbara					
AS	2	2.4%	79	9.8%	8
BL	0	0.0%	18	2.2%	2
HI	4	4.9%	47	5.9%	5
IN	0	0.0%	4	0.5%	0
WH	76	92.7%	655	81.6%	67
Total	82	100.0%	803	100.0%	82
Santa Cruz					
AS	4	10.3%	65	13.3%	5
BL	1	2.6%	15	3.1%	1
HI	2	5.1%	39	8.0%	3
IN	0	0.0%	9	1.8%	1
WH	32	82.1%	361	73.8%	29
Total	39	100.0%	489	100.0%	39

*Calculation was based on % ladder rank minorities (Fall 2009) times total CAP members last 5 years at each campus.

UCOP Academic Personnel, 5-6-2011.

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Full-Time Ladder Rank Faculty
2009**

	<u>U-WIDE</u>	<u>UCB</u>	<u>UCD</u>	<u>UCI</u>	<u>UCLA</u>	<u>UCM</u>	<u>UCR</u>	<u>UCSB</u>	<u>UCSC</u>	<u>UCSD</u>	<u>UCSF</u>
AmInd	42	1	8	3	8	2	4	4	9	1	2
AfrAm	234	40	26	23	58	1	23	18	15	22	8
Chic/Lat	498	65	59	61	106	16	37	47	39	57	11
Asian	1,352	163	207	204	270	24	129	79	65	179	32
White	6,871	1,059	1,107	753	1,328	73	430	636	360	840	285
Non-Resident Alien	61	16	12	5	4	0	3	19	1	1	0
TOTAL	9,058	1,344	1,419	1,049	1,774	116	626	803	489	1,100	338
AmInd	0.50%	0.10%	0.60%	0.30%	0.50%	1.70%	0.60%	0.50%	1.80%	0.10%	0.60%
AfrAm	2.60%	3.00%	1.80%	2.20%	3.30%	0.90%	3.70%	2.20%	3.10%	2.00%	2.40%
Chic/Lat	5.50%	4.80%	4.20%	5.80%	6.00%	13.80%	5.90%	5.90%	8.00%	5.20%	3.30%
Asian	14.90%	12.10%	14.60%	19.40%	15.20%	20.70%	20.60%	9.80%	13.30%	16.30%	9.50%
White	75.90%	78.80%	78.00%	71.80%	74.90%	62.90%	68.70%	79.20%	73.60%	76.40%	84.30%
Non-Resident Alien	0.70%	1.20%	0.80%	0.50%	0.20%	0.00%	0.50%	2.40%	0.20%	0.10%	0.00%
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Source: IPEDS Fall Staff Survey