



April 28, 2015

To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Michael Allen, Chair   
Committee on Research

Re: **APM 210-1-d, Review and Appraisal Committees**

Committee on Research discussed APM 210-1-d, Review and Appraisal Committees at their April 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Committee agreed that the proposal lacks a clear definition of who is considered to be “diverse”. Specifically, some racial, ethnic, gender, or other groups that might be considered diverse in one department or college may not be considered diverse in another. For example, women faculty are probably more highly represented in CHASS than CNAS or engineering.

It was not clear to the committee whether diversity is being incentivized or equalized. The committee did not support the idea of diversity holding as much weight in the evaluation of a candidate’s qualifications during academic personnel actions as the typical contributions in teaching and research. Having diversity in a research group should not be equally as important as doing the research itself. To take it to its extreme, under the scenario proposed, one could envision a totally useless scholar gaming the system by actively recruiting a very diverse research group, and being promoted even though the scholarly output from the group was zero. The situation could be further exacerbated by a totally useless assistant professor gaining tenure on the basis of having a very diverse group rather than by actual productivity, resulting in the university being saddled with this dead weight, with all its salary, benefits, space, and resources costs, for several decades.

Recognizing research on diversity should be raised as a separate issue. Diversity research needs to be defined in the proposal. The committee agreed that the issue of research on diversity receiving appropriate credit as valuable and legitimate research could be better handled as a memo to the department and the Committee on Academic Personnel.