I. Consultation with UCOP – Winston Doby, Vice President, University Outreach

Vice President Doby described the current state of University Outreach. State funding for Outreach was cut 50% in 03-04, and had been slated for complete elimination in 04-05 until a new budget agreement earlier this year restored $29.3 million of funding (effectively an additional 12% cut). In response, UCOP has been working with campuses on budget reduction plans and has also set a few systemwide priorities, including full protection of UC LEADS. UCOP will present cross campus budget priorities and plans in Sacramento next week.

In the wake of Proposition 209, Regental objectives for diversity and Outreach focused both on short-term goals—doubling UC eligibility for historically underrepresented minorities and increasing by 50% those who are competitively eligible—and long-term strategies to increase the capacity of low performing high schools. However, the legislature dropped school reform as a priority and moved all monies into short-term efforts. The Finance Office proposed deep, general cuts to Outreach, arguing that efforts to increase eligibility during a period of over-enrollment made no sense. At the same time, the Legislature continued to send a contradictory message to UC: increase diversity so enrollment better reflects California’s demographics.

In 2003, President Atkinson convened a strategic review panel, comprised of university, business and community leaders, to examine and identify future directions for Outreach. A new strategic mission and emphasis for Educational Outreach programs emerged, including a new name, “Academic Preparation,” and a stronger emphasis on aligning the goals of UC and California high schools. UC campuses will work in regional partnerships to identify the educational goals of neighboring communities. UC’s goal is to demonstrate success and remain accountable to Sacramento; to show that the money spent is consistent with Sacramento’s student-focused priorities. California education leaders agree that for high school students, a rigorous set of courses, not GPA or test scores, are the best preparation for higher education and the best indicator of college success. UC believes the best and most cost-effective way to prepare students is to shift from a remedial-focused spending model to a preparation-focused model. As an example, in Imperial County, which does not have a four-year institution, UC worked with the county superintendent of education to institute teacher development programs to increase student preparation in math. As a result, Imperial County saw a large decrease in the need and costs for remediation and this county now has the second highest percentage of students receiving Cal Grants in the state.

Other efforts continue to increase eligibility and enrollment rates for other underrepresented minority groups, low-income and first generation students, especially in terms of achievement in science and math. However, African American enrollment at UC is at “crisis” levels. Due to dramatic demographic shifts and shrinking resources, African Americans are no longer in the schools targeted by UC’s Academic Preparation programs.
II. Message from the Academic Senate Chair – George Blumenthal

Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal joined the meeting and thanked members for their volunteer service to the Academic Senate. He explained how systemwide Senate committee work gives faculty a voice and an opportunity to directly influence University policy. He encouraged UCAAD to be a proactive committee, and asked that members actively report to their local committees about systemwide business, and in turn, share local concerns with UCAAD. The Senate recently invested staff time in a new legislative tracking and analysis project, which is designed to keep faculty more actively informed about proposed Federal and State legislation affecting the University. Student representatives and UCOP consultants add unique and valuable perspectives to meetings.

Chair Blumenthal briefly discussed some of the major issues and challenges facing the Academic Senate and the University in 2004-2005. These include:

- Long-range strategic budget and academic planning in the context of the Compact.
- Pending Requests For Proposals related to management of the National Labs.
- Senate involvement in oversight of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation.
- Continued study of admissions, eligibility and comprehensive review policy, including admissions by exception, geographical preferences and the new SAT.
- A pending report from the AP Honors Task Force.
- Improving transfer articulation agreements between UC and California Community Colleges.
- “The Year of the Graduate Student”: how to address declines in funding for and quality of graduate education, diversity, and barriers to international students.
- Efficiency of the personnel process and gender/ethnic disparities in the step system.
- Faculty and staff health plans and long term funding of the University retirement system.

UCAAD members expressed interest in a recent report from the GAO suggesting that Title IX is not being enforced in academic areas outside of athletics, particularly the Sciences, where gender equity is an issue.

III. Message from the Academic Senate Executive Director – Maria Bertero-Barceló

Senate Executive Director Bertero-Barceló described her role and thanked members for their volunteer service to the Academic Senate. The administrative mission of the Senate Office is to support the academic mission of the faculty. The Committee Analyst is available to help prepare agendas, to draft minutes, responses and reports, and to share knowledge about the work of other senate committees. The systemwide senate office has successfully advocated for increased funding and support of local senate divisions. Last year, a white paper on the subject had a positive effect in increasing resource allocation for at least two divisions. The Senate is setting up a web page dedicated to legislative matters, and committees or committee members with expertise about particular issues are encouraged to get involved. In addition, a password-protected website for Senate committees will soon allow UCAAD to post complete agendas, minutes and working documents online. After meeting minutes are approved, they will be publicly discoverable, and members should monitor for sensitive content on the assumption that anyone could potentially see it. All systemwide committee members are now required to use UCLA travel to book airline tickets.

IV. Announcements by the UCAAD Chair – Ross Frank
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Chair Frank welcomed members and reviewed the charge of the committee, which is to study issues related to affirmative action and diversity in the context of academic personnel, academic programs, and students. The committee also discusses local divisional issues, shares strategies, and studies data on diversity and equity provided by campus and University administration. UCAAD has been authorized to hold three in person meetings this year; however, the committee may want to consider scheduling conference calls if there is a need. Members can also make a formal request for one additional face-to-face meeting.

UCAAD and UCAP’s proposed changes to APM 210, 240 and 245 were approved by Academic Council last spring and will go out for formal review this fall (there were two tiny, non-substantive changes to 240 and 245 during review by the administration). UCAAD members are encouraged to be vocal and proactive in their divisions to ensure a second round of approval. UCAAD continues to be represented on Academic Council through UCAP, and it is expected that the two committees will continue to work together this year should issues of common interest arise. UCAAD also continues to believe direct representation on Council would still be the most useful and effective way to ensure that it addresses diversity issues. At the local level, the Chairs of local diversity committees at UCSD, UCB, UCD, UCSC and UCSB have direct representation on their Councils or Executive Committees.

The Chair suggested an additional project for the committee—develop a document outlining appropriate and inappropriate practices related to preference and discrimination in accordance with Proposition 209 and Federal Affirmative Action regulations, using hypothetical and real world cases from campuses; for example, mentioning or not mentioning race during hiring decisions. Such a report could be publicized in the Senate Source.

Finally, members can email messages or documents to the UCAAD listserv by addressing an email to UCAAD-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU

**Action:** The minutes of the previous UCAAD meeting were approved with no changes.

**V. Consultation with UCOP – Sheila O’Rourke**

Director O’Rourke suggested that UCAAD members work with their divisions to prepare responses for the formal review of APM 210, 240 and 245. The responses by divisional Senates will be influential in the campus response to the draft policies.

One member asked about the Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty. Director O’Rourke offered a copy to any member who does not have one and noted that an online copy can be found at: [http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/fgsaa/affirmative.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/fgsaa/affirmative.pdf)

Provost Greenwood has approved a continuation of the hiring incentive for the President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program. UCAAD members should encourage their campuses to take advantage of the program. Because of how the program is structured, campuses that do not hire fellows actually lose FTE. Thus, it is in a campus's best interests to pursue these hires. Last year, 22 Fellows were hired across campuses. Information about the program and the list of fellows eligible for the hiring incentive is available at: [http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/ppfp/](http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/ppfp/)

One member asked about the GAO report on Title IX compliance in the sciences. Director O'Rourke noted that it is interesting to imagine extending the application of Title IX beyond the context of athletics to academics. Gender equity in athletics is the only case where federal law supports quotas in higher education as a means of demonstrating compliance. The GAO report is available at: [http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04639.pdf](http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04639.pdf)

**Discussion:** One member asked the committee to think about the issue of non-citizen faculty—not only the difficulties they face, but also their place in university definitions and concepts of diversity. New post 9-11 government controls on international visitors, visa difficulties and
increasing immigration costs are hampering the educational mission of the university. Additionally, foreign faculty and students add to the diversity of the campus community, but is hiring non-citizens of European decent sometimes seen as a substitute for hiring domestic minorities? If so, can definitions of diversity be expanded or reshaped to absorb this complexity? This could be an issue for UCAAD to explore in more depth.

VI. Report on Graduate and Professional School Enrollment

In early 2004, Academic Senate Chair Pitts asked UCAAD to prepare a formal report and recommendation considering the problem of low minority enrollment in UC’s graduate and professional school, and strategies to address the problem, including specific suggestions about how to improve recruitment efforts to increase diversity. UCAAD’s report would complement a 2003 report from the Graduate Admissions Task Force, which neglected to thoroughly evaluate the process of comprehensive review in graduate and professional school admissions as it relates to diversity. The report would be addressed to UC’s graduate and professional schools. UCAAD spent the latter half of 2003-04 working on this project, and plans to complete its work this fall. The draft of the report is organized into several sections: a set of guiding principles, departmental best practices, discussion of the role of Affirmative Action Officers on the campus level, existing systemwide programs for increasing diversity, campus strategies for increasing diversity (in compliance with Proposition 209), and data analysis.

Chair Frank asked members to think about ways to improve the organization of the report, what the intended audience is and what actions UCAAD wants the Senate or UCOP to take, to ensure that all important points from last year’s committee documents have made their way into the draft, and finally, what conclusions can be drawn from the data and what actions should follow those conclusions. (The data seem to sometimes speak at cross-purposes with some of the best practices in the text).

Members agreed that one of the main goals of the report is to ensure that diversity is included in the discussion about the systemwide crisis in graduate education. One member remarked that increasing the diversity of faculty through the “pipeline” goes beyond creating more diversity in the graduate student population. You have to fix faculty diversity at the same time, keeping in mind how potential faculty view the academic life and their ability to find a place, academically and collegially, in that life. Another member said a national study found that female graduate students in the Sciences are choosing private industry because they have negative perceptions of what awaits female academics. The leaky pipeline problem could be addressed in the report as a Best Practice, in the context of what constitutes good graduate student mentoring: e.g., Departments should create a culture that is conducive to students imaging themselves in the faculty life, and research areas should be broadened to encourage students to see themselves in the academic life. Look at the emergent interdisciplinary fields as places to look for new talent. Look at non-traditional students taking non-traditional paths to academic careers and create a cohort to surround and support them. Along these lines, Guiding Principle #6 will be recast to say the following: The admissions process shouldn’t make assumptions about persistence to degree based on traditional academic profiles. Departments have the responsibility to create an atmosphere where potential can be fulfilled and should take additional steps to make sure non-traditional students can be successful. To reach a wider applicant pool, departments should also consider the transparency of their application guidelines and materials, as well as the clarity of their call for applications. Guiding Principle #1 should be modified with: “This provides the best talent pool.”
The committee mentioned the need for an Executive Summary and discussed action items they may want to push in the report. Members believe the report can have an impact on graduate school diversity by pushing for a more proactive, clear and comprehensive admissions process and by pushing for the restructuring and rethinking of the culture of admissions in all graduate and professional programs.

An additional action item may relate to the role of **Affirmative Action Officers**, which is vague and incoherent. Depending on campus, AAOs are members of the faculty, staff or administration, but people are not widely aware of their existence. Enabling language exists on some campuses, but it is often difficult to track down. Members also discussed whether action or a mandate from Academic Council or UCOP would be appropriate in this area or whether it’s more a matter for campuses. Senate pressure could get UCOP to look at some of the issues. In any case, “Campuses should have policies” is not enough… there needs to be a clear policy defining the role and responsibilities of AAOs, made public, as well as a system of accountability. Members discussed whether the system of assigning a single campus AAO administrator works against their goals by letting rank and file faculty off the hook vis a vis diversity issues. In addition to a central representative, campuses need someone in every department, a faculty member, and these individuals need to be cohesively networked. Therefore, the report should also clarify the distinction between a campus affirmative action administrator, and a departmental affirmative action faculty representative whose job it is to look at diversity, which is what UCAAD wants instituted more globally. A new role assigned to a faculty member doesn’t cost anything and a divisional senate could get that done. Professional staffing would require funding.

One member shared an example of a best practice on her campus: a student written and departmentally distributed guide to being a graduate student, which has helped to create a more amenable culture, a boost to retention.

The shades of color in some of the data graphs are difficult to distinguish.

**Think of a sound bite:** a singular, memorable message to the report.

**Action:** Members will review the draft and suggest improvements.

**Action:** Professor Yahr will forward links to UCI gender equity data.

**Action:** Professor Dent will gather information about UCSC campus best practices.

**Action:** Professor Gailey will revise the Affirmative Action Officer best practices section.

**Action:** Ross Frank with revise section on Proposition 209 and the data charts, and ask CCGA for comments on the “Guiding Principles.”

**Action:** Members will respond to Chair Frank, Michael or the listserve no later than October 28.

**Action:** Ross Frank and Michael will revise the draft based on additional information and comments provided by members.

**VII. Campus Reports**

There was no time for formal campus reports, but several members compared how campuses conduct exit interviews to gather data on women and/or minorities who leave UC to accept positions elsewhere. One member suggested that data should be gathered on women and minorities who don’t accept job offers from UC, and why.

**VIII. Future Meetings**
Members will meet by conference call November 2 from 2:30-3:30 for discussion of the Diversity in Graduate Admissions report. The committee meets again in person on December 10 in Oakland.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.

**Distributions:**
1. Draft Report on Graduate Student Admissions and Diversity
2. Graduate Diversity Report Graphs and Charts
3. email from UCSF UCAAD member Francis Lu

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Ross Frank