

COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION
MINUTES
October 15, 2020

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 10:00 a.m.

| | | | |
|----------|------------------------|---------|--|
| Present: | Xuan Liu, Chair | Absent: | Chia-En Chang |
| | Philip Brisk | | Mariam Lam – Vice Chancellor & Chief Diversity Officer |
| | Victoria Reyes | | GSA Rep. – TBD |
| | Austin Johnson | | ASUCR Rep. – TBD |
| | Amalia Cabezas | | |
| | Katherine Stavropoulos | | |

Chair Liu asked members to introduce themselves and then provided a brief overview of the committee's charge.

***[Campus Review]* Endowed Chair Proposal: The Ronald H. Chilcote Endowed Chair in Latino and Latin American Studies and Research**

The Committee discussed The Ronald H. Chilcote Endowed Chair in Latino and Latin American Studies and Research. Having no substantial comments to add the committee unanimously supported the proposal.

***[Campus Review]* New Master Degree Proposal: 2nd Round-Master of Science Degree in Robotics**

The Committee discussed the New Master Degree Proposal: Master of Science Degree in Robotics and unanimously supports the proposal. The Committee commends the program for its commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, not only in terms of student recruitment and retention, but also in terms of its willingness to address these issues in the curriculum; algorithmic bias in artificial intelligence causes harm worldwide to many members of non-dominant groups, and it is of paramount importance that all members of society actively work to remedy the resulting inequities.

***[Campus Review]* Proposed Degree Program: 2nd Round-Joint Public Policy BA/MPP 5-Year Combined Degree Program**

The Committee reviewed the Proposed Degree Program: 2nd Round-Joint Public Policy BA/MPP 5-Year Combined Degree Program and unanimously supported the revised proposal. The Committee applauded the program's willingness to address CODEI's previous concerns regarding the lack of a DEI plan.

***[Campus Review]* Report Review: Report of the Academic Council Teaching Evaluation Task Force**

The Committee discussed the Report of the Academic Council Teaching Evaluation Task Force and expressed the following comments:

We strongly endorse the specific recommendations shown in Appendix 1 of this report, which documents the recommendations provided by the UC Teaching and Learning Centers. In turn, we

would caution against embracing the six summary recommendations made by the Academic Council Teaching Evaluation Task Force; these are significantly less specific than those found in Appendix 1, and we are concerned that adoption of overly broad recommendations would hinder authentic change in support of teaching evaluation fairness and effectiveness for faculty, and especially those who experience bias in their teaching evaluations.

We specifically emphasize the following points.

1. Encouraging awareness of bias is a necessary but insufficient condition for addressing bias. The campus cannot rely on trainings and workshops to address issues of bias by themselves.

2. To this end, we recommend that modifications and adaptations to the evaluation process be adopted for **all evaluations of faculty**. Providing an option for faculty to do additional types of evaluations in order to describe or address issues of evaluation bias shifts the workload of addressing bias back to those faculty who are most susceptible to experiencing that bias. This places the burden of addressing a structural problem onto individual faculty. As such, we would emphasize that changes to evaluation procedures should occur at the campus-level, rather than the school- or department-level. If UC and UCR recognizes evaluation bias as genuinely structural, then asking individual departments to interpret that structure for their individual department would seem to perpetuate inequities in instructor evaluation between departments and schools.

3. In that same vein, we strongly endorse the UC Teaching and Learning Centers' recommendation that mean scores on evaluation items **not** be used for evaluation purposes (see Appendix 1, page 4). Variance between departments and schools, as well as the specific effects of bias in evaluations, would suggest that summary statistics from teaching evaluations should not be used to compare faculty to one another.

4. We strongly endorse the UC Teaching and Learning Centers' recommendation that evaluations be used in a genuinely formative manner, with data driving support to faculty for pedagogical improvement, as described on pages 7, 8 and 9 of Appendix 1. We would emphasize, however, that peer review of teaching should be expected to also be affected by those same biases that affect student teaching evaluations. It is therefore critical that the peer review process be structured and overseen in a manner that promotes fairness, input from multiple individuals, and the use of multiple sources of evidence.

5. We strongly endorse the UC Teaching and Learning Centers' recommendation that evaluation language and methods be fundamentally revised, as described in Appendix 1 on pages 6 and 7. We would also suggest a standardized approach to informing and training students to complete these revised evaluations, rather than relying on the brief instructions preceding the evaluation to frame the evaluation for the student.

[Systemwide Review] Proposal: 2020-21 Curtailment Program

The Committee discussed the Proposed 2020-21 Curtailment Program and believes the proposal does not contain sufficient information to comment adequately on its potential impact on campus diversity, equity, inclusion.

UCAADE and Executive Council Update

Chair Liu provided a brief update on topics discussed at the October 8th UCAADE meeting including the effects of Covid19 on Hispanics in regard to food and housing and the lack of Hispanics in the professoriate. UCR put forth two proposals for academic personnel programs: one for faculty recruitment and one for diversity. Chair Liu also provided a brief update on the topics discussed at Executive Council noting the Chancellor was a guest at the meeting to talk about BAC recommendations and budget cuts being made with a clear focus on research and teaching in mind.

New Business/Open Discussion

Potential discussion topics were tabled due to time constraints.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.