The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity (CoDEO) is an important part of faculty governance and collegial responsibility in the University of California system. As a committee of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, CoDEO is appointed by the Senate’s Committee on Committees and consists of seven members. This Committee is charged with representing the Division on all matters of affirmative action and diversity in the employment of women and ethnic minorities at UCR. It further represents the Division on all matters concerned with student affirmative action and diversity including efforts to monitor and to increase the number of students from underrepresented groups who enter undergraduate, graduate and professional programs. At its discretion, CoDEO may make recommendations for improvement in specific practices and general policy.

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity met four times during the 2014-2015 academic year and undertook the following actions:

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity adopted a revised Conflict of Interest Statement which expanded the statement regarding personal affiliations of committee members that could be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations including any action or discussion involving their current spouse, partner, or family member.

The Committee conducted a review of its current bylaws to put forward an organizational change and consider formal recommendations towards a regular implementation process to carry out each duty listed in the committee charge. The Committee is continuing progress towards developing a formal proposal.

In keeping with its charge to make recommendations for improvement in specific practices and general policy, the Committee considered the following Systemwide reviews:

Proposed Revisions to APM 080 - Medical Separation
The intent of APM - 080 remains a non-disciplinary method to medically separate a faculty member or other academic appointee who has exhausted eligible leave and who remains unable to perform the essential functions of his/her position or another vacant position for which the appointee is qualified, due to a disability or medical condition. Proposed revisions are intended to 1) bring APM - 080 into conformance with Regents Standing Order 101.1(b), Employment Status, 2) clarify authority to medically separate faculty with and without tenure or security of employment and appointees who are not members of the Academic Senate, and 3) revise language so that it is congruent with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Additionally, the proposal is responsive to campus administrator and faculty requests to clarify the medical separation review process and to delineate the required consultation with the Disability Management Office, the written notice of intent to separate, the written notice of medical separation, and the appropriate approval authority.
The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity considered the proposed revisions to APM 080 – Medical Separation and unanimously supported the changes.

Proposed Revision to APM Sections – 133, 210, 220, and 760

Revisions of Language on Evaluating Contributions to Diversity

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) and the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) worked together on a proposal to modify APM 210-1-d to clarify its language regarding evaluation of contributions to diversity in merit and promotion reviews. The proposed changes are intended to precisely state the University’s commitment to faculty diversity while also avoiding the misperception that research in some fields will be valued more highly than research in others without regard to its academic quality.

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity reviewed and discussed the proposed changes to the APM – 210-1-d, Review and Appraisal Committees and voted in favor of the revisions. The Committee noted that the policy will encourage diversity awareness that can be evaluated in teaching, research, and service throughout all academic disciplines. The Committee further considered the key issues undertaken by the working group. Specifically, the Committee examined if the new wording adheres to the original intention of the APM section ensuring that faculty efforts in promoting equal opportunity and diversity receive their proper credit in the academic review process. The Committee feels that the proposed wording strengthens this purpose and is broad enough that it can be opened to many interpretations across all fields of research, but still specific enough to change the way in which the diversity issue is approached.

The Committee considered if the proposed language removed the implication that diversity contributions are to be considered as a forth criteria in the merit and promotion process and the implication that these contributions would be given more credit than other contributions. The Committee agreed the proposed language does not change the current evaluation process nor impair a faculty member’s ability to attain a fair and equitable review based on the three required criteria of teaching, research, and service. The inclusion of the language “due recognition” emphasizes diversity without requiring it to be a forth criteria in the review process and provides an opportunity for the recognition of diversity as a plus, but does not put a malice on faculty who do not have this element present in their file.

It is the Committee’s view that the APM is intended to provide guidance and is intentionally written in a manner that is open to interpretation. In this spirit, the Committee suggests that upon the implementation of APM 210-1-d into campus procedures, the Senate be acutely involved in the process.

Revisions of Language on Extending the Eight-Year Limitation on Service

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) recommended that APM 133-17-h, Stopping the Clock for the Care of a Child or Children, be amended to expand the permissible reasons to “stop” the eight-year service limitation “clock” due to exceptional personal circumstances beyond the faculty member’s control which may impede timely progress. The draft language under consideration proposed that, in addition to childbearing and child care, a faculty member may request to stop the clock for a serious personal health condition, for illness of or for bereavement of a family member, or other significant circumstance or event.
While current policy provides for an automatic exclusion from service limitations when leave is related to childbearing or childrearing (APM 133-17-g-3 and APM 760-25-30), the proposed revisions specify that campus Academic Personnel procedures will establish how a faculty member may apply for the extension of the eight-year rule when the request is related to a serious personal health condition, for illness of or for bereavement of a family member, or other significant circumstance or event, or how the request will be evaluated.

In addition to amending APM 133-17-g-j, related revisions were proposed to APM sections 210-1-c-4, 220-18-b, and 760-30-a. Language in sections 210-1-c-4 and 220-18-b added reference to stopping the clock due to personal reasons in addition to family accommodations as defined in APM 760. Also, language was added to confirm that all evidence produced during the probationary period, including the period of extension, counts in the evaluation of the candidate’s review file. Language removes from APM 760-30-a the child’s five-year age limit for an academic appointee to qualify for an extension of the eight-year rule.

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity considered and approved the revisions to APM 133-17-g-j, Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles and noted that the expansion of permissible reasons to “stop” the eight-year service limitation “clock” due to exceptional personal circumstances beyond a faculty member’s control is relevant and of great importance. The Committee further considered and approved of the proposed editorial changes found in APM 210-1-c, Review and Appraisal Committees, APM – 220-18-b, Professor Series, and APM – 760-30-a, Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing.

Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence
The University of California issued a revised Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence that updated the University’s policy on preventing and responding to allegations of sexual misconduct on its campuses. The proposed revisions are intended to update the policy in accordance with Final Regulations implementing the requirements of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) that was reauthorized by President Obama in 2013. These Final Regulations were issued by the U.S. Department of Education on October 20, 2014 and become effective July 1, 2015. Additionally, proposed revisions address outstanding issues with the efforts of the President’s Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault, and improve clarity as requested by faculty, students, and staff.

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity considered the proposed changes to the Presidential Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence and expressed no concern with the proposed revisions.

Doctoral Student Support Review
At the November 2013 Regents meeting, Provost Aimée Dorr and then Academic Council Chair Bill Jacob reported on the challenges facing UC’s academic doctoral education in an increasingly competitive environment. The Regents asked for specifics about what to do and how they could be helpful. Subsequently an All-UC Doctoral Student Support Conference was held at UC Irvine in April 2014 to develop a number of proposals in the areas of non-resident supplemental tuition
(NRST), competitiveness in net stipends, professional development and partnerships, and competitiveness in diversity and student recruitment. Through a process that involved faculty collaboration and a number of break-out groups, the conference produced multiple proposals in these categories. Immediately following the conference, a Steering Committee was established for the purposes of further refining these proposals with the stated purpose of preparing formal Regents’ items for the January 2015 Regents meeting. In early summer, they were also reviewed by a number of Systemwide committees, including CCGA, UCPB, and UCAAD.

The Steering Committee produced a number of proposals and background materials and analysis related to doctoral student support for committee review:

- **Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition**: After thoughtful consideration of all of the issues associated with NRST, the Steering Committee is putting forward the following options for review: 1) Change Regental policy so that NRST is not charged after the first year; 2) make it a UC policy to either reimburse faculty grants for NRST or not charge NRST to faculty grants at all; or 3) encourage campuses to engage in financial NRST work-arounds, and share those plans with other campuses, without a formal change to UC or Regental policy.

- **Net Stipend Competitiveness, Multi-Year Funding, and Transparent Offer Letters**: Conference participants identified UC’s net stipend competitiveness, multi-year funding, and transparent offer letters as three key areas central to better doctoral student support. The related analyses and review materials detail the additional funding to eliminate the University net stipend competitive gap, and makes the recommendation that multi-year funding become a stated policy of each UC Graduate Division.

- **Professional Development**: Conference participants also identified professional development as a key area of attention. With the changing landscape of postgraduate education, increasing numbers of doctoral students are pursuing careers outside of higher education. In particular, graduate students expressed a need for a greater focus on professional development, especially for those that are investigating alternative career opportunities. Towards that end, the Steering Committee is proposing a UC-wide graduate student career portal be created using a UC-wide shared services model.

- **Diversity Proposals**: In addition to the more tangible aspects of competitiveness, such as NRST and net stipends, the Steering Committee feels strongly that improving diversity also contributes to the University’s competitiveness. With this in mind, therefore, the Steering Committee is be forwarding two new diversity proposals, the UC Hispanic-serving Institutions and Tribal Colleges and Universities Initiative (UC HSI-TCU) and the UC LEADS proposal, along with two existing programs, the UC Historically Black Colleges and Universities Initiative (UC-HBCU) and summer bridge programs, which are designed to assist under-represented minorities (URMs) other under privileged students who are entering Ph.D. programs.

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity considered the Doctoral Student Support Proposals and opined that since professional development is very discipline-oriented it would be very difficult to have a professional development program that would work well for all graduate students. The Committee felt the professional development options are quite costly and perhaps unnecessary, but recommends option one or two to be the most appropriate action.
In response to the Nonresidential Supplemental Tuition (NRST) issue, the Committee recommends changing the Regental policy so that NRST is not charged after the first year. The main focus is to relieve the burden of the Nonresidential Supplemental Tuition since this negatively impacts UCR’s pool of competitive graduate students.

In response to the three draft budgets (or models) proposed for the professional development, the committee felt option three would be most effective while remaining economical.

For all other recommendations, the committee felt the proposed solutions were well thought-out and could be applied equitably.

In keeping with its charge to make recommendations for improvement in specific practices and general policy, the Committee considered the following Campus reviews:

**Proposed Revisions to UCR Target of Excellence (TOE) Program**
The proposed revisions to the TOE guidelines extend the program to include appointing outstanding scholars as well as those adding to campus diversity. In addition, the revisions provide clarification to the appointment process and requirements at each level of review.

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity discussed the revised guidelines for the Target of Excellence (TOE) program and voted in support of the proposal with a few minor modifications. Under the heading criteria for target of excellence (TOE) appointments, the committee recommends modifying the first sentence to read:

The Target of Excellence (TOE) program is intended to provide an “opportunistic” mechanism for appointing outside scholars, including those who will enhance campus diversity, who would contribute substantially to the excellence of research and instruction on campus.

The Committee recommends modifying the last sentence in the third paragraph to read:

This individual should clearly be someone who will rise to the top during a normal faculty recruitment.

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity is very pleased with this document and its commitment to excellence and diversity and recommends these changes in wording in order to strengthen this commitment.

**Student Proposal for the Implementation of a Gender Studies Breadth Requirement at UCR**
The Associated Students of UC Riverside (ASUCR) are seeking the implementation of a gender studies breadth requirement that will ensure all students take at least one gender-related course before they graduate. At present, all students at UCR are required to fulfill an ethnicity requirement by taking one ethnic studies course. This requirement has been a great success, and has helped to promote diversity and student awareness of racial and ethnic inequality in society. Gender and sexuality, in intersection with race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, also profoundly shape people’s life chances, their status in society, their sense of self, and their capacity for self-determination. Students argue it is UCR’s obligation to offer students some insight into the
workings of such powerful, ubiquitous, and complex forces—if only so that students may be effective at the professions they take up after graduation. ASUCR has submitted a full proposal of suggested courses for Senate committee consideration.

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity discussed the Student Proposal for Gender Studies Breadth Requirement. While the committee agrees with the idea of the policy’s intent to educate students on gender inequality and gender-related violence, it does not feel the implementation of this requirement should limit a student’s current course offerings nor should it be required at the expense of an ethnic studies course.

In addition, the extensive list of course offerings as proposed are not relevant in fulfilling the requirements towards gender studies. The Committee suggests the list be fleshed out and reduced to include only relevant courses that may satisfy both Ethnic and Gender Studies requirements.

The Riverside Division of the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity was represented on the University-wide Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) by the Chair of CoDEO, Zhenbiao Yang, who updated the Committee members of the issues under discussion at the statewide level.
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