REPORT ON A SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS WITH A SAMPLE OF CONVENIENCE OF LINE FACULTY IN THE COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

Background of project. In January 2001, I was appointed by the EVC as one of three equity advisors, along with Professors Douglas Haynes and Alladi Venkatesh. Our goal was to gather information about the status of and perceptions about faculty diversity at UCI and, based on our findings, to make recommendations to the Chancellor. To this end, we interviewed the Deans of all campus Schools, including the College of Medicine, and prepared a summary report that was submitted to the Chancellor January 2004. A follow-up meeting with the Chancellor in April also occurred, in which our findings and recommendations were reviewed and explored.

I was initially approached to consider this position by Sue Duckles, Associate Dean of Faculty Development for the College of Medicine. Because of my background in qualitative research, we discussed the possibility of my implementing a project of informal faculty interviews on the subject of faculty diversity. After our series of interviews with the heads of campus Schools, this seemed to be a logical next step. What follows is a detailed report on the findings of this project. It should be noted that the sample described below is a nonrandom sample of convenience, and likely biased in the direction of individuals who had strong feelings about the issue under discussion. In an effort to adequately protect the anonymity of respondents, the sign "s/he" is used to identify third person singular speakers. No reference is made to specific ethnic or racial background of respondents (although this information was obtained) because the small numbers of individuals at UCI-COM in certain groups would make identification a fairly easy process. For this reason also, no additional information is provided about field or specialty or about length of time at UCI or the administrative positions (or lack thereof) held by respondents.

The definition of diversity used by the equity advisors was broad, and included historically underrepresented minorities, foreign-born faculty, and faculty members with disabilities. Although gender was excluded as a major focus because this issue was being addressed by the NSF ADVANCE program, some respondents referred extensively to gender issues, either in relation to underrepresented minorities or independently. Also, it was sometimes unclear when respondents used the term diversity whether they were referring to historically underrepresented minorities, or American-born or foreign born individuals who were other than non-Hispanic white.

Method. A letter was sent out to all line faculty in the College of Medicine, asking them to participate in an informal conversation with me about issues of faculty diversity. I guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity to all participants (although not all requested it) and also promised that all participants would have an opportunity to preview this report and make any comments or corrections they wished as well as to express opinions at variance with this report. In response to this initial letter, 14 faculty members responded. A second letter, similar in content, was sent to a list of faculty who self-identified on University forms as belonging to an ethnic/racial group other than non-Hispanic white. Sixteen faculty members responded to this follow-up letter. The total number of respondents therefore was 30. Limited demographic information will be provided about respondents to avoid possible inadvertent identification. All were line faculty members. Sixteen were born in a country other than the U.S, while three were

first or second generation Americans. Eight respondents were female. Four were members of historically underrepresented minority groups. Interviews were conducted in person and by telephone. Most face-to-face interviews were tape-recorded, and tapes later transcribed. Six face-to-face interviews were not taped at the request of the interviewee, but notes were taken. During telephone interviews (6), I took computer recorded notes during the conversation. Interviews lasted from 45 minutes to 90 minutes. Because of the informal nature of the interviews, as well as the not insignificant time constraints in some cases, not all questions were asked of all respondents. During several of the interviews, respondents demonstrated very definite ideas about what they wanted to discuss. Quotation marks throughout the text indicate exact words, phrases, or sentences used by a respondent.

Family backgrounds. The majority of American-born faculty was raised in what they considered to be fairly racially homogeneous, non-diverse towns. Foreign-born faculty members were about equally divided in terms of describing their hometowns as diverse or homogeneous. Several respondents came from highly educated households, but several also were the first in their families to attend college. However, regardless of the educational level of their parents, almost all respondents reported that education was highly valued in their homes. Regarding the kinds of messages about diversity that respondents received from their families while growing up, many mentioned coming from backgrounds that encouraged tolerance and the importance of treating people as "just people." A few acknowledged that their families and/or communities exhibited some bias or prejudice against those from different ethnic or racial backgrounds. Foreign-born faculty sometimes mentioned being told they would have to work hard to be recognized, and the importance of being adaptable. Adult children of immigrant parents brought up their parents' desire to make a better life with more opportunities for their children.

Personal beliefs. Personal beliefs of interviewees were notable for an emphasis on a strong work ethic, and valuing drive, persistence, and ambition: "When you are down in the ditch you have to get yourself out of it." Individuals from underrepresented minority backgrounds uniformly expressed pride in their heritage. Several non-Hispanic white respondents expressed appreciation for diversity, saying that they had always enjoyed and been interested in people from other backgrounds. Only a few stated their personal commitment to the importance of promoting minorities, while a few more endorsed the concept of social justice in explaining their concern for minority advancement. Others, more disgruntled, expressed the view that "if all things are equal, the minority individual will not be chosen" and "You'll never be cut a break because you belong to a minority."

The largest number, however, believed that with equal opportunity, gender and minority status wouldn't matter. "Policy that's blind to ethnicity... will automatically achieve a diverse, harmonious work force." A somewhat more extreme position stated that "people advance who deserve to advance." Most interviewees endorsed the perspective that people are just people: "I treat everyone the same"; "I made the discovery that in a sense skin color didn't make a difference, it was the human being." Another variation on this theme was that different cultural groups have more in common than they have differences. Several respondents expressed the opinion that individual differences almost always trump ethnic differences.

While several commented that they found discrimination of any sort repugnant, overall this was a fairly cautious group in terms of promoting systemic change. Some overtly expressed suspicion of activism, feeling that it was not an effective strategy: "I fly under the radar, you know, I'm not one to raise fires... for me, that was the best way, to focus on what I was doing to the best of my ability." "Some people are in too much of a hurry to buck the system or to change the system... it puts everybody on the defensive and bitter, and then it's harder, and I've seen a lot of that around here." Individuals who were foreign-born or from minority backgrounds often shared the belief that they had to work harder than non-Hispanic white colleagues in order to be recognized: "I had to be twice as good as the others;" "I felt I had to work harder, publish more, do this, do that to be recognized." A couple of individuals from backgrounds other than non-Hispanic white expressed the view that minorities should just "prove themselves and not complain."

Perceptions of foreign-born faculty about American society and academia generally. Most of these individuals were not minorities in their countries of origin, and so felt they had significantly different experiences than those of historically underrepresented minorities in this country. However, several characterized themselves as "outsiders," both in their own country and in the U.S., but with the benefit of being able to fit into many groups and move easily between groups. They often did not completely identify with their own ethnic group in this country (i.e., Latino, African-American, Asian). Almost all who were asked this question stated that they stayed in the U.S. primarily because of career and research opportunities. In the rather charming frame of one scientist, "I was doing exciting things in my career. Every night I worked very late. I just forgot to go back."

In terms of American society, a handful regarded the U.S. as hospitable to foreigners, and valued its emphasis on equal opportunity. Several appreciated the more open society they discovered in America, and enjoyed its diversity. A number expressed the perspective that since they were from a foreign country, it was up to them to adjust to American culture. Someone else observed that although the adjustment was easier for some foreign born scholars than others, this was a matter of individual differences rather than a characteristic of a given ethnic or racial group. A slightly larger number of foreign-born respondents had definite concerns about discrimination at the societal level. As one individual stated even-handedly, "Some are interested in foreign-born, others have a phobia." Another respondent put it this way: "If native-born, things go more smoothly." One individual stated that American society is xenophobic against immigrants in general. Another cited specific examples of encountering looks of wariness in stores and malls based on his/her ethnic appearance.

The majority stated that they never felt discriminated against in academia, and a handful described academia as a welcoming environment, as encapsulated by this quote: "As long as you're doing good science, people will really appreciate you." A smaller number were unsure about whether they had ever been targets of discrimination. They admitted that they sometimes rationalized negative remarks, or tried not to take such remarks personally. Others were more concerned about possible discrimination, sharing the perception that "the system is not completely merit-based. There is some prejudging if the person is not an American." In a similar vein, another commented, "If you are not an American-trained physician, you are always at a slight disadvantage." Others were

more philosophical: "I do that little extra, just to remove any doubt" that s/he does not measure up because s/he is not American.

A subset of this issue was the question of language. An intriguing point raised by two individuals was the perception that people respond differentially to accents depending on the country of origin, with northern European accents being prestigious and adding positive value, and other accents regarded as a liability. Most foreign-born faculty members agreed that fluency in English was extremely important to one's career, and several stated that there was some level of discrimination against those with poor language skills. On the other hand, one internationally recognized researcher noted that limited language skills hadn't held him back: "I made early contributions and became famous, so people listened to me, even though my language was not perfect."

Representation of minority faculty in the field generally. Several respondents were adamant that "science is colorblind," "academia is very accepting of diversity." In terms of underrepresented minorities, most agreed there were very few, regardless of field. "Minorities are very underrepresented...African-Americans doing science, virtually zilch." Several felt, reflecting on their field, that in the words of one, "diversity receives lip service, but little real attention." Several respondents expressed particular concern about the lack of African-American presence, one individual noting despondently that "we're not even training the next generation, much less increasing numbers."

Others had a more optimistic view. A smaller number described their own field as "quite diverse" (although this seemed to refer mostly to foreign born and Asian-Americans rather than underrepresented minorities).Ten respondents felt that there had been a significant increase in women, although not minorities, in their field. Some of these respondents expressed the view that more minorities were entering their specialty, although there were still very few to be found. One stated unequivocally that in his/her field "opportunities for minorities were increasing, no doubt whatsoever." Others believed that their field "works hard to attract Latino and African-American faculty." Others expressed a more nuanced perspective. They pointed out that diversity had improved at professional schools, but not in research programs; or in primary care specialties, although less so in sub-specialties; or that at the senior level, the field was still homogeneous, but at the junior faculty level it was more diverse. Still others observed that in their own, relatively "young" fields, the number of minorities exceeded 50%; and that these fields were "leaders" in terms of gender equity.

An interesting perspective on the relationship between one's field and diversity was expressed by the extended metaphor of research-as-one-big-party articulated by this enthusiastic respondent: "The field is so exciting, there's so much fun stuff to do that the more people we can get involved, the better. It's almost like a big party that everybody has so much fun that they say, oh, you gotta come and join the party... and when you're having a lot of fun doing something and there's room for more people to come in and have fun doing that, your natural tendency is to invite more people, and if those people happen to be women or African-American, all the better." Would that this attitude represented the views of all College of Medicine faculty!

The perceptions regarding representation of foreign-born, and especially Asian foreign-born, faculty was quite varied. Some believed that there were many more opportunities for Asians in the UC system and in academia generally because, in the words of one non-Hispanic white respondent, "they play the game the same as whites."

Several mentioned that they had observed more Asian faculty and residents, described by one respondent as "a huge influx." A few individuals, themselves Asian, were convinced that prejudice against Asians was widespread. They cited as evidence the numerous Asian post-docs and the numerous articles by Asian-surnamed authors in leading journals contrasted with the relative dearth of Asians at the faculty level. These individuals complained that, in the words of one, if foreign-born scholars are "excellent, they are seen as above average; if above average, they are treated like average."

When asked specifically whether professional organizations and societies were concerned about diversity within their field, opinions were mixed. Some stated that, within their professional society, there did not appear much interest in improving the situation of minority faculty. In the words of one disillusioned faculty member, task forces were formed which always concluded "we need to do something, but that's as far as it goes." While these efforts are "not not sincere," s/he could only conclude that his/her "professional colleagues lack either the tools, the ability, or the will to actually effect change." Others described their professional societies as very diverse, and actively trying to promote minority advancement, while still others were uncertain about outreach efforts.

Representation of minority faculty at UCI and COM. One respondent commented honestly that s/he "didn't really know any minority faculty" so couldn't comment. Several people said unequivocally that there was "inadequate representation," particularly in the line series: "Representation of underrepresented groups is a dismal thing;" "The university is not owning up to its responsibilities. They'll pull out all the stops to get somebody like -----. All the stops are pulled out and it's, they'll do anything. Now if an African-American applied for a junior faculty position here and made the cut, you know, you think they'd do that, I doubt it... it would just be the standard recruitment." Several people stated there had been no improvement in underrepresented minorities at UCI-COM: "It's been flat-line for the past 30 years." Individuals adopting this perspective worried that the College paid lip-service only to the value of diversity. In particular, there was a concern that an "old-boys' network" in academia generally and at UCI-COM does not encourage diversity. This group believed that there was insufficient dialogue on this topic, a lack of interest in improving the ethnic mix, no systematic effort to attract minorities, and no active outreach. They worried that the priority of the College was research excellence, and diversity was seen as irrelevant to this goal.

On the other hand, a larger number felt that there was already "lots of diversity" at the faculty level, including improvements in the hire pool. A fair number of respondents described their departments as being very diverse, comprised of individuals who "meld well and work on common problems." It was often not completely clear whether the diversity referred to in these statements involved gender, foreign-born, or historically underrepresented minority groups. In the opinion of this group, UCI makes a sincere effort to recruit a diverse undergraduate and graduate student body, medical student body, and faculty. In the words of one respondent, "There's a need to train physicians in this part of the country with extra sensitivity and language abilities for the Spanish-speaking population... and I think the medical school is aggressively pursuing that." Others attested that the COM administration was concerned about the lack of diversity, has an appreciation for the value of diversity, and is making efforts to remedy the situation.

Perceptions of attitudes toward minority/foreign born faculty at UCI-COM. In terms of discrimination at UCI-COM, the largest number of respondents rejected the idea that there was any overt discrimination here. Many believed that at the faculty level, no matter what one's background, people were judged on their abilities. "It's all about the work, not the color of the skin." "Scientific competence is the overriding thing." Another noted s/he had cautioned his/her lab staff against any discriminatory behavior after 9/11. One person believed that minority faculty were "well-treated" at UCI-COM and faced no special problems. Several expressed disbelief that minorities would be given preferential treatment under any circumstances. A fair number stated they had never heard of any bias or discrimination against any minority or foreign-born colleagues. There was also a widespread perception that the COM values diversity, desires a more diverse faculty, and is sensitive and responsive to diversity issues. In the words of one respondent, "If you had several candidates and two of them were equal and one of them was named [Spanish surname], that person would get selected." Several respondents described their labs as diverse environments where everyone "fits in, regardless of background."

However, as one faculty expressed it, "It [discrimination] hasn't been apparent. That doesn't mean it doesn't exist." Several faculty reported either directly observing or hearing about some discriminatory or biased practices. One non-Hispanic white respondent disclosed having seen examples of patients reacting negatively to ethnic doctors, although s/he didn't feel this had negatively affected their careers in any way. Another mentioned observing differences in the OR in terms of how teams interacted with black and white surgeons. A couple of other individuals reported hearing comments by colleagues implying that minorities are not as good or as smart as others. Several others stated they had heard comments to the effect that someone had gotten a break because s/he was a member of a minority group, and reported this was a source of resentment.

While most respondents did not feel there was any evidence of overt discrimination at UCI-COM, several did talk about more subtle, "second-order" discrimination against people who might not "fit the mold." One minority respondent made the distinction between "acceptable and unacceptable discrimination," the former being behaviors that are hurtful or insensitive without necessarily having a negative impact on an individual's career, and gave as an example this overheard comment: "If the department gets richer, maybe we can hire more white male faculty." Another minority faculty member believed that, "although no one would admit it, within the College of Medicine, there was widespread support for 209" (the proposition making affirmative action illegal). Another respondent had never seen evidence of discrimination in terms of receiving merits and promotions, but believed that ethnicity would "make a big difference" when considered for administrative positions. One respondent said somewhat sarcastically that it was hard to think of examples of discrimination because there were so few minority faculty at COM.

A couple of respondents felt there was either some bias against foreign born faculty, or at least tensions between foreign- and native-born faculty, and that the contributions of Asian faculty "counted less" than those of non-Hispanic white faculty. In particular, the perception that there were "too many Asians" at this campus was cited. The majority responded that UCI was unusually diverse and hospitable to foreign born faculty. As one faculty member noted, "We are more likely to take someone with a very

strong accent who might not be completely understandable, simply because their work is good."

A handful of respondents identified what they perceived to be potential limitations of the current COM culture. Several individuals claimed that, to succeed in this system, one had to be a yes-person, whether to chairs or to the dean. They expressed the concern that minorities may be less likely to be "yes" people because they are outsiders, more likely to hold nonconformist views, and so may be perceived as more risky to hire and/or advance. People in influential positions "are chosen particularly for their obedience," because they "don't want to rock the boat," "know their place," "don't make waves," and "acquiesce to the old way of doing things." One respondent wondered whether current leaders will continue to choose "people like themselves," or whether they will branch out to create a more diverse leadership group. Among this group of respondents, there was the perception that the culture of COM as a whole is top-down, closed, and "resistant to change."

Personal experience of respondents at UCI. Thirteen of the female, foreign-born, and historically underrepresented minority faculty stated unequivocally that they had never felt personally discriminated against or encountered any form of bias at UCI (white male faculty were not asked this question). A small group of foreign-born faculty stated they were happy and grateful to be at this institution, and felt appreciated here. A somewhat larger group comprised of both minority and foreign born respondents stated that their colleagues were generally supportive and helpful. Respondents were less sure that their careers had not been affected in some subtle way by their minority status, but tended to state they had received all necessary lab and research resources, as well as appropriate salaries. Of those individuals who felt that they had not received all expected research support, none felt that this was due to discrimination. One Asian said half-jokingly that s/he may have benefited from the positive stereotype of Asians: "Wow! You're Asian. You must be smart!" One woman believed she had received her academic position because of affirmative action programs: "I was a shoe-in."

Although the largest number denied experiencing discrimination, six people stated that they had felt personally discriminated against at UCI because of gender/ethnicity/country of origin issues. One respondent gave as an example being told s/he received a particular academic appointment only because of race/ethnicity/gender. Several faculty members also stated they believed their careers had been adversely affected by their minority status. An additional handful also wondered about this issue, but couldn't say for sure. "It's nothing I could prove." Several described themselves as not very skilled at recognizing discrimination: "First, I have to tell you I am not very observant so I kind of don't pay attention to these details;" "There might be more bias than I recognize." Another stated s/he looks for discrimination more now than when s/he first arrived in this country, but if s/he doesn't receive some academic award or experiences a slight, s/he is more likely to attribute it to him/herself than to race. Another agreed that, if s/he doesn't succeed, or is passed over, s/he is more likely to blame him/herself than to "call the race card." A couple of members of minority groups acknowledged feeling socially isolated at UCI. A couple of M.D.s also disclosed that patients had refused to see him/her based on race or ethnicity.

A handful of respondents expressed a general disillusionment with UCI-COM that had nothing to do with diversity issues. These individuals felt excluded from the system

of influence, disenfranchised, marginalized, or ignored, with a legacy of disappointment and alienation. "I just do my thing, I feel indifferent about the institution."

System of academic advancement (CAP). CAP did not come up often in these conversations. However, when it did, it was generally in a critical context. One faculty member thought that the system of promotion was not equitable, and often rewarded those who bring economic benefit, rather than academic achievement, to the institution. Another respondent commented that the system rewarded "self-centered, make-it-at-all-costs, entitled, cut-throat" type of people: " 'I am the center of the universe and I deserve it.' That kind of entitlement, it, I realize it's so *useful* in an academic environment." A handful of individuals made the point that the way faculty excellence is defined by CAP is too strict, and uses a very narrow definition of scientific productivity. These individuals pointed out that the traditional model of research values only the single powerful individual who leads the lab. This model prioritizes independence. CAP needs to adapt a more flexible model that makes room for acknowledging collaborative work, which is where the "really interesting stuff" is happening. If "the three pillars" of academia (research, teaching, and service) were really weighted more equally, it would lead to more success in academia for a broader range of faculty, including minority faculty. This in turn would produce "a much healthier university."

The glass ceiling. The largest number of respondents felt there was no glass ceiling at UCI-COM. "If you have that interest, the door is open." Some thought a glass ceiling had existed previously, but not any longer. Some expressed uncertainty. For example, one individual stated s/he had heard comments that you can't reach the top of the system if you are not Caucasian, but in terms of his/her own particular aspirations, s/he saw no limiting factors. A few foreign-born faculty expressed the opinion that Asian faculty were shut out from positions of influence and prominence: "There clearly has been a glass ceiling for foreign-born Chinese." Only one respondent was "very concerned" about the possibility of a glass ceiling, and worried that because of his/her ethnicity, s/he might not be seen as leadership material.

Successful minority faculty. A few respondents speculated about what qualities might be characteristic of minority faculty who succeeded in the academic culture. They often painted a picture that resembled themselves. "Hard work" was the phrase most frequently used. Others mentioned personality, opportunity, mentors, resources, stamina, confidence, and the ability to do good science. The respondents who addressed this question emphasized that these also tended to be the qualities that described successful academics generally, regardless of race or ethnicity.

Grant discrimination. When one respondent mentioned his/her concern that discrimination against Asian foreign-born faculty existed at NIH, a question on this issue was added to the interviews. This did not prove to be a widely held viewpoint, although a few more individuals did express the fear that NIH committees might be biased against Asian surnames on grant applications. Most respondents who were asked this question stated confidently that, as one person said, "NIH committees are about the science." Individuals who had served on NIH committees had never seen any evidence of penalization for ethnicity, and most agreed the process was "colorblind." One even asserted the NIH was sensitive to issues of diversity, and had the intention to encourage wider range of diversity among awardees. Others were less certain: "In grant decisions, you never know what is discussed."

Why minorities are underrepresented in research. This admittedly speculative question produced some interesting answers. Some attributed the lack of minority representation in research careers to the nature of the minority experience. These individuals conjectured that most members of minority groups grow up not seeing research as something important or of high value. The following quote is typical of this view: "The exposure that African-American students get to possible careers in science, careers in academics is just not there... I mean, how many African-American kids have much contact with someone who's doing science?" Another respondent put it in these terms: "I think graduate school is a bit of a luxury. If you look at most people who have done well, most of the faculty, they tend to really come from professional homes. It's like a second generation career." Additional support for this perception opined that it was difficult for minorities to become bench researchers because it requires preparation from a very early age. One respondent identified the problem as more socioeconomic, and argued that if one controlled for income level, there would be no difference in the presence in research between minorities and non-Hispanic whites.

Others conceived of research as a self-sacrificing career in that it entailed the relinquishing of significant financial reward as well as demanding 100% commitment. These respondents conjectured that underrepresented minorities might think more in terms of professional school than research careers because it offered better job security and better income. One professor offered the idea that being a physician scientist was very demanding so that it might "not be attractive" to women and minorities. In a different interpretation, certain respondents thought that because of their strong desire to give back to their communities, minorities would be more attracted to the professions as an occupation that would be more immediately beneficial to people than basic research. One person thought that academia would not be perceived "as a very attractive place to go 'cause it means you're a... you have to represent your group." Interestingly, very few individuals mentioned systemic or societal indicators as limiting factors.

Difficulties facing minorities in academia generally. In answering this question, several respondents again referred to the nature of the minority experience in explaining the challenges they faced in academia generally. One respondent expressed this sentiment as follows: "I never met anybody who was born to a drug addict mother and grew up on the streets who actually made it inside our system." Others expressed the view that little value was placed on education in minority communities, where all too often an anti-intellectual attitude prevailed. "The root process of the problem here and that's disintegration of the family structure." Another stated more sympathetically that when one comes from an indigent background, it is very hard to make the leap to graduate or medical school. One respondent responded by denying that minorities encountered any special difficulties in the academic system. Another individual claimed that in fact minorities received unfair advantages: "They always think they can never do anything wrong, although you know their achievement is not as good as other white or other people."

The largest number of respondents, however, laid blame for the difficulties of minorities succeeding in academia at the foot of committee service. In the words of one individual, "They're [minority faculty] overworked in a very unprincipled way... they're put on one committee after another." Two respondents identified the need to "give back" as interfering with academic success for minorities. "My attitude is that the community

can take care of itself." "You expect them [minority faculty] to be successful in all the arens tha a white faculty member has been successful in. Then on top of that they gotta carry their community on their shoulders too."

When asked about foreign-born faculty, a large number of respondents, both foreign and native-born, identified language difficulties as the most significant obstacle to academic success. One respondent believed that the problem was deeper than language, however, and had to do with understanding cultural nuances, the need for assertiveness in American culture, and how to interact in a comfortable manner with colleagues. From this perspective, foreign-born faculty sometimes had more difficulty understanding how the system worked, and lacked the advantages that could come from academic networking. Along similar lines, another participant commented that foreign-born individuals might not know how to negotiate effectively for resources; or, if they were here on a visa, they might feel they had less bargaining power. There were also different opinions expressed about the so-called "bottle-neck" of Asian post-docs. One viewpoint was that they were doing excellent work, were publishing in leading journals, and were at the forefront of science, but were not receiving faculty positions because of discrimination. In the opposing view, the bottleneck existed not because of prejudice but because many foreign-born post docs lacked adequate communication skills and held unrealistic expectations about where their training would lead.

Problems in recruitment of minority faculty. A majority of respondents cited **the pipeline problem** as the primary explanation for why there was so little diversity in the College of Medicine. According to this way of thinking, a very small pool of qualified minority candidates exists, for which competition is fierce. Almost everyone agreed that a larger pool was necessary, and that the pool of diverse individuals was very small. Some complained that although a larger pool was desirable, there really aren't any activities that the institution can take to increase the pool: "I think you're stuck with the pool you have." Others perceived that the pool was becoming more diverse, but competitive minority candidates still tended not to come here. "Unfortunately they're not coming here, but they're out there." This phenomenon was attributed variously to other institutions having more resources, being more prestigious, or being perceived as better for the candidate's career.

However, a few individuals observed that the pipeline theory could also be used as a rationalization for not pursuing diversity more aggressively: "This [pipeline] argument has also been used to discriminate in saying we don't need to hire because they aren't out there." This individual went on to say, "We have to look at ***why*** there aren't appropriate candidates, and how hard have we looked, and are we really committed to having this medical school from the students to the residents to the faculty representative of the community and the state."

A couple of other ideas were suggested by a few respondents. One believed that "the big issue in recruitment is will they get along because with tenure they'll be there for 30 years." While a given search committee is looking to fill a research or teaching niche, it is also looking for someone whose personality will fit in. This respondent felt that minorities might be perceived as a less good fit. Elaborating on this idea, another stated that, while most faculty members valued diversity in principle, they tend to choose people like themselves in recruitment situations. Another speculated that minority

candidates might have fewer interpersonal, informal connections within academia, so that for them, the recruitment process was more formulaic.

One respondent discussed what s/he defined as "narrow vs. flexible" searches. This person observed that narrow searches will inevitably yield a narrow pool. "We define it [the search] very narrowly, and invariably we get a whole bunch who don't do that, but they still send in their applications, and we say, 'You don't do that,' and then we start looking and say, 'Wow, that's really cool,' then all of a sudden we say, 'Well, you know, we really got to have this person, [even though] they're nothing related to what we want to search for'; and then we say, 'Throw the ad out the window," and you cast a broad net..." This sharing of the inner workings of one department's search process provides an intriguing alternative view about how to conduct searches. Others, however, made the opposite argument, i.e., if you broaden the search, you *will* increase the pool, but you will *not* be able to increase it at the top level.

Many respondents felt diversity was not a priority for search committees, and in their experience was never or rarely mentioned in the search process, but they differed as to whether this was a good or a bad thing. One individual noted that s/he had never interviewed a candidate who was not non-Hispanic white. Another observed s/he had never seen the chair of a search committee who was not non-Hispanic white. But others maintained that the task of search committees was to make decisions on scholarly merit and research excellence. The priority should be the professional work so that whoever is doing that work and is the best candidate is selected. Search committees' charge is to look for the best candidate. As one individual expressed it, "The committee shouldn't spend too much time trying to get the right pool, bur should concentrate instead on getting the right candidate." On the other hand, a minority opinion expressed by one faculty member was that search committees should stop opposing excellence and diversity because, in fact, "they rarely get the best anyway."

Problems of retention of minority faculty. Most respondents did not feel that retention was much of an issue, and did not feel there were any particularly problems for minority faculty in terms of surviving in academia and making tenure. Once minority faculty individuals are successful at this level, it was the general consensus that they get absorbed into the system fairly smoothly. A few felt the situation was more difficult for foreign-born faculty, because "they don't make friends as easily, and have more networking problems." Several mentioned the mentoring program in the COM aimed at junior faculty as a successful effort to increase the chances of tenure for junior faculty. One respondent proposed that more of an effort be made to reach out to newly recruited faculty, build relationships with them, not take them for granted, and nurture in-house talent.

Mentoring. The issue of mentoring emerged in several different aspects of these interviews. Predictably, most of the mentors cited by respondents were white males. This was true for white men, women, and minority faculty. Two men mentioned an important female mentor/role model, as did two women. With only one exception, all respondents who mentioned mentors stated they had been essential to their professional success. Many waxed eloquent about those who had helped pave their way: "I have been the beneficiary of a mentor who's helped me throughout my entire career and all of my battles... I think I would not have been successful in moving up the ranks had it not been for this individual." "That particular advisor was fabulous and still is fabulous. I'm in

UNDERSTANDING THE PLACE OF FACULTY DIVERSITY AT UC IRVINE: A REPORT BASED ON INTERVIEWS WITH ACADEMIC DEANS BY COMMUNITY EQUITY ADVISORS PROFESSORS DOUGLAS M. HAYNES, JOHANNA SHAPIRO AND ALLADI VENKATESH

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 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. One Dean observed that 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 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 know better) 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 an overly narrow definition of research excellence at UCI in determining advancement and promotion plays a critical role in decreasing the possibility of faculty diversity in practice. Deans who stressed this point distinguished between the exclusive privileging of hypothesis-driven, reductionistic investigations at the expense of the more atheoretical, field-work, and policy-based inquiries to which some minority faculty are drawn, because of their greater immediate relevance to real-world problems . It was also of concern to several Deans 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 restrictiveness of the currently employed 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 some 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 a faculty which has no legitimized outlet for pursuing activities that nevertheless are theoretically 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. Active promotion of faculty diversity involves more than serving on a search committee and waiting for a diverse pool of applicants to materialize and apply. Rather, 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 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 University-Wide Competition for $100,000.00 or more 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 that Focuses on UCI's Experiment in Diversity Available for Faculty Recruitment.

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 Develop 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.

Understanding the Place of Faculty Diversity at UCI

1. What is your School's present diversity policy, if there is one?
2. Is the policy regularly updated?
2a. How do you evaluate to what extent the policy is actually being followed?
2b. Do you think faculty members in your School are generally aware of this policy? Are they supportive of this policy?
3. Where do you obtain information and other resources about faculty diversity? (i.e., the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, the Office of Academic Affairs, Executive Vice Chancellor, or other)? 4. Do these offices or other sources routinely update you on diversity information or about diversity resources or not?
5. Under what circumstances do you usually solicit information from these offices or sources?
6. What kind of information do these offices or sources generally provide? **What kinds of information are most useful to you from these sources?**
7. What type of information do you solicit? **Are there types of information you'd like to have, but don't know where to obtain them?**
8. What kinds of information or resources about diversity are disseminated to the faculty? (Chairs and Directors meetings? Or search committees? Or both? Others?)
9. Is it on a regular basis? If so, how often? **How do faculty respond? What evidence do you have that such information affects their attitudes or behavior?**
9a. Do you know of either chairs or faculty within your School whom you regard as especially interested/active in working on issues of diversity? If so, do you regard their efforts as successful or unsuccessful, and why?
10.Do you usually meet with your search committee before each search cycle?
11. If so, how is the diversity policy of the school reflected in the discussion of the search goals and outcomes?
12. In these meetings, do you disseminate information or other diversity resources to the chairs of search committees or committee members such as Best Practices?
12a. How are diversity goals reflected in the subsequent actions of the search committees and how is this influence assessed?
13. Are departments and programs encouraged to develop prospective applicants pools?

14. Please describe them?
15. At the conclusion of the search cycle, do you review the outcomes with your search chairs and departments?
16. In your opinion, where do search committees run into most difficulty in terms of adequately considering diversity? What would help search committees the most in overcoming these obstacles?

Understanding the Place of Faculty Diversity at UCI

1. What is your School's present diversity policy, if there is one?
2. Is the policy regularly updated?
2a. How do you evaluate to what extent the policy is actually being followed?
2b. Do you think faculty members in your School are generally aware of this policy? Are they supportive of this policy?
3. Where do you obtain information and other resources about faculty diversity? (i.e., the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, the Office of Academic Affairs, Executive Vice Chancellor, or other)? 4. Do these offices or other sources routinely update you on diversity information or about diversity resources or not?
5. Under what circumstances do you usually solicit information from these offices or sources?
6. What kind of information do these offices or sources generally provide? **What kinds of information are most useful to you from these sources?**
7. What type of information do you solicit? **Are there types of information you'd like to have, but don't know where to obtain them?**
8. What kinds of information or resources about diversity are disseminated to the faculty? (Chairs and Directors meetings? Or search committees? Or both? Others?)
9. Is it on a regular basis? If so, how often? **How do faculty respond? What evidence do you have that such information affects their attitudes or behavior?**
9a. **Do you know of either chairs or faculty within your School whom you regard as especially interested/active in working on issues of diversity? If so, do you regard their efforts as successful or unsuccessful, and why?**
10.Do you usually meet with your search committee before each search cycle?
11. If so, how is the diversity policy of the school reflected in the discussion of the search goals and outcomes?
12. In these meetings, do you disseminate information or other diversity resources to the chairs of search committees or committee members such as Best Practices?
12a. How are diversity goals reflected in the subsequent actions of the search committees and how is this influence assessed?
13. Are departments and programs encouraged to develop prospective applicants pools?

14. Please describe them?
15. At the conclusion of the search cycle, do you review the outcomes with your search chairs and departments?
16. In your opinion, where do search committees run into most difficulty in terms of adequately considering diversity? What would help search committees the most in overcoming these obstacles?

Shapiro, Johanna

From: Haynes, Douglas
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2004 10:19 AM
To: Johanna F. SHAPIRO
Subject: RE: final report

Dear Johanna;

I actually thought about presenting the contents of the report to Deans who have been so generous with their time and candor. Ideally, I think it is best to present a general description of our findings once the EVC commits to a course of action to address faculty diversity in a substantive matter. A useful venue for the next step is the Deans' council. If some or all of our recommendations are adopted, our findings are more likely to be seen as making more resources available to Deans without burdening with excess tasks. As for Dr. Kehoe, I was not aware that the EVC appointed her as a liasion between the Community Equity Advisors and his office. It strikes me as rather odd to clarify boundaries by putting the director of the Advance Program between the CEA and the EVC. This is a topic that should be raised in our future meeting with the EVC, and we should meet with Dr. Kehoe after learning about the response of the EVC to our report. In the meantime, I do plan to provide Dr. Kehoe with a copy of our report with a cover note as you suggest requesting confidentiality. I do however want the EVC and Herb to have sufficient time (maybe a week) to read and review the report before sending out the report to Dr. Kehoe. I like them to address the merits of the report first and foremost.

Best wishes and enjoy Ohio,

Doug

>Great, Doug. You've done an amazing job, and been an inspired leader
>in this process.
>
>Not to be niggling, but let me share two thoughts. Regarding
>Priscilla, I wasn't entirely clear on what she was telling me, so I
>probably didn't express it well to you. What I thought she said was
>that the NSF people wanted a clear boundary between the ADVANCE program
>and the Community Equity Advisors (I suppose we could still wave when
>we saw each other :-)); but that WEARING A DIFFERENT HAT (presumably
>given to her by the EVC) she would now be our liaison to the EVC,
>independent of her ADVANCE role. I know, it doesn't make a whole lot
>of sense, but we probably need to clarify the situation before too
>long. Maybe a meeting when I get back from Ohio? In any case, I think
>sending her a copy of the report is a strategically wise move.
>
>The second thought unfortunately I'm also not clear about, but here
>goes. Is there any value in sharing the report with the Deans who took
>time from their busy schedules to talk with us? In some respects, this
>report is a little hard on them (not personally, I don't think, but
>more systemically), so partly I'd like to avoid ruffling any feathers.
>On the other hand, I'd hate for it to appear that we somehow approached
>the EVC behind their backs (I have images of the EVC storming the
>campus, waving our report, and shouting, no more excellence without
>diversity! :-) - actually, we should be so lucky). On the third hand,
>in some respects I regard this document as a confidential report
>solicited by the EVC and for the EVC. As you can see, I'm a little
>worried to what purposes the report will be put. And along those

>lines, I DEFINITELY think a cover note to Priscilla should encourage
>her to treat the report as for-her-eyes-only. At this stage of the
>game, until the EVC has a chance to react, I don't think it would be
>constructive to have her sharing this with ADVANCE or other faculty.
>But that's just me. What do you think about all this?
>
>Thanks for your reactions, Johanna
>
>
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Haynes, Douglas
>Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2004 1:16 PM
>To: Johanna F. SHAPIRO
>Subject: Re: final report
>
>Dear Johanna;
>
>Thanks for the touch-up on the documents. I especially appreciate your
>sensitivity to the meaning of research and its implications for faculty
>diversity. You should know that I cc'd my reply to Alladi regarding his
>comments on the final report, which he approved. As for the
>relationship between the Community Equity Advisors and the Gender
>Equity Advisors, it has always been ill-defined relationship. So, Dr.
>Kehoe's message is not altogether surprising. As I understand it, the
>funding for our positions originates from the office EVC. I will see
>that Dr. Kehoe receives a copy of the report. Like you, I want to
>continue to cooperate with the Advance Program when and where
>convenient.
>
>Best,
>
>Doug
>
>
>
>
>>Doug, you're amazing. Your writing is powerful and passionate. This
>>is great. I do have a few comments:
>>1) Since Alladi's name appears (appropriately in my opinion), has he
>>approved this version? I would like his thoughts and feedback,
>>especially since he is now on CAP.
>>
>>2) The versions of the interview schedule and the list of Deans
>>interviewed should be the versions we submit, since I was able to
>>remove the red (:-)), and caught a few typos.
>>
>>3)I am still not completely satisfied with the way some Deans'
>>concerns about "research excellence" (and we have to be quite clear
>>that not everybody thought CAP is too restrictive) have been worded.
>>I think we
>have
>>to be extremely careful not to imply that a) empirical,
>>hypothesis-driven research is bad/useless b)minority faculty
>>can't/aren't capable of/aren't interested in doing research of this
>>nature. Either of these implications would be a sure way of shooting
>>ourselves in the foot! And of course we don't mean either, so it's
>>purely a question of language. I did some rewriting, but please look
>>this section over carefully and improve on it in any way you can.
>>
>>4) Last week, Priscilla Kehoe set up a meeting with me to talk about
>>the interviews I'm doing in conjunction with Kristen MOnroe's project.
>>However, during our discussion, she mentioned that a) the community
>>equity advisors were being separated from the NSF ADVANCE program,
>>since the NSF administrators of this program had strong negative

>>feelings about in any
>way
>>confounding women and minority issues b) She, Priscilla, was being put
>>in charge of the equity advisors as a liaison to the EVC (I'm not
>>quite clear on this, and I could have misunderstood, but that was the
>>impression I formed). All of this is by way of saying that a) we do
>>need to clarify what's going on, and make sure we're all on the same
>>page but in the meantime b) it seems like a good idea either to send
>>Priscilla a prelimary draft for vetting or at least send her a copy at
>>the same time that we submit the final report to the EVC. I feel
>>strongly our conclusions are our conclusions, and I stand behind them
>>completely, but I'm trying to figure out the right move politically
>>(and I suck at stuff like this).
>>
>>So please think over these points, and let me know how you'd like to
>>proceed. Unfortunately, I'm going to a conference in Ohio Thursday
>morning,
>>and tomorrow is filled, so I wouldn't be able to talk in person till
>>next week. I know you want to get the report in quickly, as do I, but
>>I want to ensure it has the best launching possible.
>>
>>Thank you, Johanna
>>
>>This e-mail/fax message, including any attachments, is for the sole
>>use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and
>>privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or
>>distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient,
>>please contact the sender by reply e-mail/fax and destroy all copies
>>of the original message.
>>
>>
>>
>>Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:DeanQuestions.FINAL.doc
>>(WDBN/MSWD) (000AFDB2)
>>Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:FACULTYDIVERSITYREPORT.doc
>>(WDBN/MSWD) (000AFDB3)
>>Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:DEANINTERVIEWSCHEDULE.doc
>>(WDBN/MSWD) (000AFDB4)
>
>
>This e-mail/fax message, including any attachments, is for the sole use
>of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and
>privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or
>distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient,
>please contact the sender by reply e-mail/fax and destroy all copies of
>the original message.