SUMMARY NOTES ON THE PLACE OF FACULTY DIVERSITY AT UC IRVINE

I. School-Wide Diversity Policies: No Perceived Need for Policy or Regular Attention in Representative Committees

All schools lacked a specific faculty diversity policy. While acknowledging this absence, Deans pointed to the campus policy as their de facto School policy. It was generally not made clear how, or whether, the campus policy is customized to fit the needs of each School. The absence of a School-specific faculty diversity policy is mirrored in the faculty representative bodies. With the exception of the School of Social Ecology, none of the remaining five Schools interviewed has a Dean's Advisory Committee on Diversity or the equivalent. Nor is diversity a regular or standing agenda item for School Executive Committees. As one Dean observed, when the subject comes up at all, it is generally associated with a grievance.

II. Attitude toward Value of Diversity Among Faculty: Recognition, But Complacency

Deans recognized the importance of diversity to the university's multiple missions of research, teaching and service. They noted that diversity is important to a) serve a diverse student body; b)broaden the pool of undergraduate and graduate students, especially from minority groups; c) provide role models for minority and non-minority students; d)deliver services, i.e., health care, to ethnically, racially, linguistically, culturally, and socioeconomically diverse communities; and e)ensure the widest representation of expertise in public policy matters. Some also recognized that scholarship and research could be beneficially influenced through diversity, although there was not universal agreement on this point. All commented at some point that their faculty held a uniformly positive view of diversity. At the same time, most Deans acknowledge that the subject is not an integral part of the policy making apparatus, much less the day to day concerns of faculty. The directives from the central administration concerning diversity are ordinarily ignored (presumably because faculty members feel that they are more familiar with the issues and needs of their School in this area and how to address them) or are viewed as unnecessarily intrusive in the affairs of the School.

III. Structure of Faculty Labor and Rewards: Narrow Definition of Research Excellence and Rewards Discourages Faculty Diversity

Recruitment-
The anomalies surrounding diversity are manifested in faculty recruitment. While Deans endorse faculty diversity, all acknowledge that its realization is uneven across the campus. Most ascribe this problem to limitations in the "pipeline", that is, the small pool of qualified minority applicants entering and graduating from top tier programs from which UCI would consider recruiting faculty candidates. Still, they concede that the definition of research excellence at UCI plays a critical role in framing the possibility of faculty diversity in practice. Deans who stressed this point were making a distinction between overly narrow theoretical and methodological models of research, which discouraged more atheoretical, field-work, and policy-based investigations. The other point is that other forms of scholarship and academic contributions, i.e., mentoring, teaching, organizing special projects, committee service, participation in community programs, have very little value in the advancement process.

The narrowness of this definition of research excellence and its rewards also has substantive intellectual and social consequences. First and foremost, it circumscribes even further the range of eligible faculty applicants, a pool derived from an already small number of PhD granting institutions. Second, at least in the experience of Deans, the actions of the Committee on (?) Academic Personnel have engendered a faculty perception that a narrow conceptualization of research is privileged at the expense of other types of intellectual labor. Third, these consequences combine to foster an impression of indifference to diversity, whether understood intellectually or socially, both in terms of the mission of the university and within many Schools.

Further, the narrow definition of research excellence and rewards distorts faculty understanding of diversity. Rather than understanding research and its rewards at UCI as an outcome of voluntary practices and preferences, too often they are assumed to be fixed universals. This in large part explains the tendency of some Deans to distinguish diversity from excellence even when stating their

commitment in principle to the former. That is to say, we regularly heard Deans state that they are "committed to diversity but not at the expense of excellence". Left unsaid is the notion that realizing excellence through diversity is not only impracticable but also may imperil the very reputation of the campus. This perception of faculty leaders at the School level sheds light on the dearth of systematic School-based activity to promote faculty diversity.

IV. Mentoring for a Diverse Faculty: Encouraging Indifference

Mentoring is a largely undeveloped area of School concern with the exception of the College of Medicine. At most, Schools encourage informal and consensual interactions between senior faculty and junior faculty. The nature of these professional relationships and their effectiveness are unclear in large part because of the informality of the programs. By contrast, the COM has by far the most developed and integrated mentoring program. Administered by an Associate Dean, junior faculty meet on a quarterly basis to assess career progress and familiarize the faculty member with the personnel process, i.e., merit, mid-career, and tenure reviews. This program has been particularly effective in educating junior faculty and their departments about the importance of protecting the time of junior faculty and distributing department service and teaching requirements in a more equitable manner. Of note is the fact that the program does not target women or minorities, but is available to all junior faculty.

While there are few formal affirmative mentoring programs, junior faculty are often subjected to negative "systemic" mentoring that has implications for diversity. Many Deans observed that underrepresented minority faculty are often drawn to academic activities of teaching and service, as ways of "giving back" either to their own community or to society in general. The prioritizing of research as the key criterion for faculty rewards with teaching second and service trailing a distant third means that junior faculty members receive a potent message that service may imperil their future career, at least at UCI. The result is sometimes faculty who have no legitimized outlet for pursuing activities that nevertheless are theoretically

3

recognized as making crucial contributions to the fabric of academia.

Conclusion and Recommendations

It should be abundantly clear that faculty diversity at UCI has not and will not take care of itself. The current unsystematic approach towards faculty diversity reflects a university culture that historically has not and currently does not consistently and substantively engage, reward, and foster diversity as an integral feature of the mission of the university. In general, academic Schools lack specific diversity policies and rarely integrate the subject matter into their representative or deliberative bodies. The benign indifference of most Schools towards diversity is reinforced by a faculty reward structure that privileges a narrow definition of research while devaluing other forms of scholarship, diminishing the significance of teaching and discouraging service.

Advancing faculty diversity as a long-term project is one that ordinarily falls under the category of service, a largely under-valued component of faculty labor. Advancing faculty diversity involves more than serving on a search committee and waiting for a diverse pool of applicants to materialize and apply. It requires a sustained commitment of faculty time and resources to cultivate a diverse pool of applicants, to engender faculty leadership in diversity within and without the School, and to communicate with the wider university community about the centrality of diversity to the institutional mission of UCI. UCI should move firmly beyond the false notion of excellence and diversity as different, and potentially competing, concepts and instead robustly embrace the integrated construct of excellence through diversity. The following recommendations are based on this approach.

University-Wide Recommendations

1. Adopt and Publicize Faculty Diversity Principle for UCI.

2. Establish a Chancellor's or Executive Vice Chancellor's Standing Council or Advisory Body of Faculty Diversity.

3. Create a University-Wide Competition for $100,000.00 among the Academic Schools to Develop and Implement Faculty and Graduate Student Diversity Plan(s).

4. Appoint an Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel to coordinate campus faculty diversity resources.

5. Establish Rotating Diversity Professorship with $50,000.00 Budget for Faculty Leadership.

6. Produce Video and Brochure for Faculty Recruitment. that Focus on UCI's Experiment in Diversity

School-Based Recommendations

1. Develop and Adopt School-Specific Faculty Diversity Policies, Tailored to the Needs of Each School.

2. Establish a Dean's Advisory Committee and/or Standing Committee on Faculty Diversity in School-based Executive Committees.

3. Development and Adopt Strategies to Improve Visibility of Departments/Schools Among Institutions with Significant Minority Graduate Populations.

4. Communicate Diversity Policy and Campus Principle to Job Candidates.

5. Develop Proactive Search Strategies that Make Vigorous Use of Minority Graduate Student Association Lists and Informal Minority Networks.