

**REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR'S ADVISORY
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY**

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

JULY 19, 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings and recommendations of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Diversity. The Committee focused its work on faculty recruitment and retention and staff recruitment and retention.

Our principal findings are as follows:

1. Since the implementation of SP-1 and SP-2, Berkeley has seen a significant reduction in the number of underrepresented minority (i.e., African American, Latino, American Indian) students; in African American staff; and in women and underrepresented minority faculty. Berkeley is a less diverse campus in 2000 than it was in 1995 while the state's population is becoming increasingly diverse.
2. The university's land-grant status and its position as the leading public university in the nation are powerful reasons to recruit faculty, staff and students who reflect broadly the demographic makeup of the state of California. Some faculty, however, see any consideration of diversity as a detriment to Berkeley's continued academic excellence. To pursue diversity as an end in itself will have no credibility with large numbers of faculty.
3. There are misperceptions and limited knowledge on campus of what is permitted under UC Regents' Resolutions SP-1 and SP-2.
4. "Best practices" where diversity enhances academic excellence must be widely disseminated. Concrete incentives must be provided to units if diversity is to flourish.

Our main recommendations are:

1. Create the post of Vice Chancellor for Equity and Diversity, reporting to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, with the resources and authority to promote diversity and hold units accountable for their performance.
2. Implement a broad-based approach to strengthen diversity. This approach could include the establishment of privately funded faculty positions for women and minorities, and a "grow your own" philosophy in which the careers of talented women and minority Berkeley graduates are monitored, thereby facilitating their recruitment back to the campus.
3. Reward units that are successful in diversity recruitment and retention, and assist those which are not.
4. Implement a number of education and training programs to sensitize individuals in key decision-making roles with regard to faculty and staff recruitment and retention, and to make them more aware of available resources and strategies.
5. Initiate several data collection and analysis efforts to identify other effective initiatives to promote and monitor diversity.

INTRODUCTION

In November 1999, Chancellor Berdahl convened the first meeting of the Chancellor's Committee on Diversity. The charge to the Committee was in part:

...to develop a set of recommendations, both long and short term, and strategic in nature, to sustain and promote diversity in all its manifestations on the Berkeley campus...The Committee is charged to develop a set of strategies that will be effective in the current environment to achieve the diversity we all value...The Committee should consider how its recommendations can be fully integrated into the university's mission of teaching and research and how they can be fully embraced by the larger community in which we live and work. (See Appendix I for the complete Charge to the Committee).

Members of the Committee were drawn from a variety of campus units. (See Appendix II for the list of members). During the next six months, the Committee consulted numerous publications and met frequently to hear the views of different individuals about the issue of diversity on the Berkeley campus in particular and in higher education more generally. (See Appendix III for a list of speakers who addressed the Committee).

1. Definitions, Some Historical Perspective and the Law

There is no single or simple definition of "diversity." The dictionary definition is "the condition of being different or having differences." For higher education, a more meaningful explanation is as follows:

...a multiplicity of ideas, experiences, and viewpoints in the classroom and on the campus as a whole...Schools hope that having a student body and faculty that hold many different viewpoints and approach issues from different perspectives will promote learning and lead to the production of greater knowledge for all. Seeing their mission as one of socializing their students and helping them grow into good citizens, many schools also believe that if people from different backgrounds, who hold different values, can learn to communicate and respect differing points of view, both in and out of the classroom, they will be better prepared to deal with the challenges of living in a pluralistic and multicultural democracy.¹

The American system of higher education has been grappling with the issue of diversity probably since its inception. In the classic work, The Education of Henry Adams, the author describes how his education at Harvard in the 1850s was "enlarged" when a trio of Virginians were by chance tossed into a class composed overwhelmingly of New Englanders.² Adams notes that he and the Virginians "knew well how thin an edge of friendship separated them in 1856 from mortal enmity."³

Harvard President Neil Rudenstine observes that this experience "altered Adams' consciousness, and forced him to confront and assess a type of person he had never before known. It drove him to reach new conclusions about himself and his own limitations, and even led to some understanding (vastly oversimplified) of representative southerners and the South. Chance had "enlarged" his education, almost in spite of himself."⁴

¹ Miranda Oshige McGowan, "Diversity of What?" in Race and Representation: Affirmative Action, Robert Post and Michael Rogin, eds. (New York: Zone Books, 1998), pp. 237-250.

² See the reference to this experience in William G. Bowen and Derek Bok, The Shape of the River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), p. 218.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

Prior to World War II, it was not uncommon at numerous elite private colleges and universities to exclude or routinely limit the number of faculty and students drawn from various religious and ethnic minority groups (e.g., Catholics, Jews, Irish-Americans, Italian-Americans). These barriers, however, have eroded and largely disappeared, especially in the past three decades.

As the charge to the Committee points out, the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s brought the issue of racial diversity and the black/white divide into sharper focus on college campuses. From the 1960s to the 1990s, in part because of growing social consciousness and in part in response to political and economic pressures, institutions of higher learning opened their doors to increasing numbers of people of color, including those designated as "underrepresented minorities."⁵

The pursuit of diversity among faculty, staff, and students is consonant with the mission of the University of California (UC). The act establishing the University—the Morrill Act—is named after Vermont Representative Justin Smith Morrill, who pioneered the concept of the “land grant institution.” He introduced the first land-grant bill in 1857, and subsequently saw it signed by President Lincoln and enacted into law on July 2, 1862. As Morrill stated years later: "The fundamental idea was to offer an opportunity in every State for a liberal ...education to larger numbers, not merely to those destined to sedentary professions, but to those much needing higher instruction for the world's business, for the industrial pursuits and professions of life"⁶

In periodic statements on this issue, the University of California has consistently demonstrated that it is an inclusive institution that values diversity greatly. For example, in the 1988 Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, the California state legislature specified that all segments of higher education should "strive to approximate by the year 2000 the general ethnic, gender, economic and regional composition of recent high school graduates." The UC Regents noted in its own 1988 resolution that:

The University seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that, beyond meeting the University's eligibility requirements, demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socioeconomic backgrounds and characteristics of California.⁷

But the University is not immune to demographic shifts and to the political and economic repercussions from these shifts. A recent analysis of California demographic trends and their implications offers some striking observations:

As recently as 1970, the state was 80 percent white.... [By] July 1, 2001, California will become the first big state in the nation in which non-Hispanic whites are officially no longer a majority...California will become by far the largest proving ground for what it may eventually be like to live in a United States in which no one racial or ethnic group predominates...This transition [has been] fueled by million of new immigrants, mostly Latin American and Asian, and the higher birth rates of foreign-born residents...It has already had striking social, political, economic and psychic effects, including a series of bitterly fought

⁵ In this report the term “underrepresented minorities” will refer to African American, Latino and American Indian. The term “Latino” includes Hispanic (those with a Spanish language background), Chicano (Mexican-Americans), and those with a Portuguese language background. Asian Americans represent approximately 40% of the entering freshman class at Berkeley and are not included in this term.

⁶ Cited in Development of the Land-Grant System: 1862-1994, p. 6. See Henry S. Bruner, Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, 1862-1962, updated by the Office of Public Affairs, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1995.

⁷ Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, 1988 Regents Resolution (mimeo).

ballot initiatives to curtail government services for illegal immigrants, and to end state affirmative action programs and bilingual education.⁸

As is widely known, diversity issues at the University of California received nationwide attention in the mid-1990s during the debate about and after the passage of two UC Board of Regents resolutions and an amendment to the California State Constitution. These initiatives are summarized below:

The “Policy Ensuring Equal Treatment Admissions” (SP-1), approved July 20, 1995 and effective January 1, 1997, stipulated that “the University of California shall not use race, religion, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin as criteria for admission to the University or to any program of study.”

The “Policy Ensuring Equal Treatment Employment and Contracting” (SP-2), approved July 20, 1995 and effective January 1, 1996, stipulated that “the University of California shall not use race, religion, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin as criteria in its employment and contracting practices.”

Additionally, both SP-1 and SP-2 stipulate the following: “Nothing in [this section] shall prohibit any action which is strictly necessary to establish or maintain eligibility for any federal or state program, where ineligibility would result in a loss of federal or state funds to the University.”

Section 31 was added to Article I of the California State Constitution (“Proposition or Prop 209”). It went into effect on August 28, 1997 after the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the initiative was constitutional and denied further review. On November 3, 1997, the U.S. Supreme Court denied further appeal of Prop 209. This Section specifies that “The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting...’state’ shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the state itself, any city, county, city and county, public university system, including the University of California, community college district...or any other political subdivision or governmental instrumentality of or within the state.”

Until further notice, all UC--and therefore Berkeley--policies that seek to enhance diversity must conform to these two resolutions, which are in turn consistent with the California State Constitution as amended. At the same time, all UC programs must continue to conform to federal law, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, and nationality, and which requires certain affirmative actions, such as planning, monitoring, and advertising procedures, to implement this nondiscrimination mandate.

2. Impact

Since the passage of Resolutions SP-1 and SP-2 and Proposition 209, there has been a significant reduction in the number of underrepresented minority students; in African American staff; and in women and underrepresented minority faculty. Representative statistics concerning students, staff and faculty document these findings.

The 1997 freshman class consisted of:

7.3% African American
13.4 % Latino/Chicano

⁸ Todd S. Purdum, “Shift in the Mix Alters the Face of California,” The New York Times, July 4, 2000, pp. A1, A12.

0.7% Native American

In 1997, a total of 21.4% of the freshman class was underrepresented minority students out of about 8000 admitted students. This was the last year race could be used as a basis for admissions. In that year 7.5% of California High School graduates were African American, 30.3% were Latino/Chicano, and 0.9 % were American Indian.

The 1999 freshman class consisted of:

3.6% African American

9.1% Latino/Chicano

0.6% Native American

In 1999, 13.5% of the freshman class was underrepresented minority students out of about 8400 admitted students. In that year 7.5% of California High School graduates were African American, 31% were Latino/Chicano, and 0.9% were American Indian.

In two years, the total number of underrepresented minority students declined from 750 to 477, a decrease of 36.4%.⁹ Moreover, for African American and Latino/Chicano students, the Berkeley freshman class of 1999 was less representative of the California high school graduate population than the freshman class of 1997.

For minority and women staff, a comparison between 1989 and 2000 reveals that:

- The African American work force declined from 17.1% to 14.9%, while Asian Americans increased from 13% to 16%.
- At the executive and senior management levels, the minority and female share of the work force has decreased almost continuously since 1994; minorities currently represent 11% and women 16% at the executive level.
- Minorities and women grew most in the professional staff, with 33% and 63% share of the work force respectively.
- Latinos and American Indians made only modest gains. The former increased from 9.3% to 10.4% of the work force; the latter from 0.9% to 1.1% of the work force.¹⁰

With respect to faculty recruitment, a comparison of the data before and after SP-2 implementation is as follows:

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Faculty Recruited</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Minorities</u>	<u>Underrepresented Minorities</u>
1992-1996	237	33%	25%	11%
1996-2000	233	27%	20%	4%

The conclusion from these data is that “the rate of hiring women and minority faculty members dropped significantly in the four years following SP-2.”¹¹ This decline was observed across the humanities, the social sciences, the physical sciences, and the professional schools.

⁹ Office of Student Research, University of California, Berkeley.

¹⁰ U.C. Berkeley Staff Work Force Trends and Implications, 1999-2000 (mimeo).

¹¹ Sheila O’Rourke, “Hiring Data for Faculty Appointments,” October 4, 1999 (mimeo).

In sum, Berkeley is a less diverse campus in the aftermath of the passage of SP-1, SP-2, and Prop 209. Given the long-term demographic trends in the California population, Berkeley is less representative of the California population than it was five or ten years ago. If current trends at Berkeley and in the state continue, Berkeley will become less and less representative of the population in the first decades of the twenty-first century.

3. Focus and Structure

After considerable deliberation, the Committee determined that it could not, in the allotted time, perform a detailed analysis of all aspects of the diversity issue. Given that other bodies on campus are addressing questions of undergraduate admissions policy and curriculum matters, the Committee chose to focus instead on two sets of issues: faculty recruitment and retention, and staff recruitment and retention. A sub-committee was organized to address each set. (See Appendix IV for a list of the members of each sub-committee). Each sub-committee drafted an analysis of the main problems and proposed recommendations for their group. These analyses and recommendations were shared with the full committee and reviewed at length. Much of the work of the two sub-committees was then melded together for this report. Recommendations that apply only to faculty or to staff are duly noted.

Observations and Challenges

Undoubtedly, there are many in the Berkeley community who see “diversity” as a desirable goal, but are uncertain how it can be promoted. There appears to be limited knowledge on campus of what is and what is not permitted under SP-1 and SP-2. In fact, these Regents’ resolutions do not forbid the University from seeking a diverse faculty and staff. Nor do they prohibit us from recognizing and seeking to address issues and problems that arise from the uniquely diverse population of California. They do, however, require that race and ethnicity not be considered as criteria for hiring of faculty and staff. The challenge for the campus, then, is to abide by this stricture and still identify productive methods to promote diversity.

With respect to faculty diversity, the loss of the Target of Opportunity Program has been significant. This program was a major pathway for women and minority recruitment. Countering its loss is a challenging task. This challenge comes at a time when increasing numbers of women and minorities are earning doctorates. Indeed, nationwide, women received more than 40% of all doctorates in the 1996-97 academic year. Minorities were awarded nine percent of all doctorates in 1997, an 8.4% jump over the previous year and a 40% increase since 1992.¹² Admittedly, this rise is not true across all fields. The natural sciences and engineering continue to have relatively few underrepresented minority graduates each year. Yet, overall, just at the time that the available pool of women and minorities who are qualified to enter the academic job market is increasing, Berkeley is seeing a reduction in their numbers on our faculty.

Ironically, industry is placing increasing attention to diversity in its hiring practices. There is growing emphasis on multifunctional teams and groups composed of people with diverse backgrounds and perspectives. Ethnic and gender diversity is highly valued in multifunctional teams. Industry, in turn, has put pressure on the professional schools to produce more women and minority graduates. And it is not uncommon for industry leaders to express dissatisfaction with these schools’ graduation rates for women and minorities.¹³

The University has a number of exemplary programs and procedures to promote the hiring and retention of a diverse faculty. But these capabilities are not widely known on campus and they are consequently not well integrated into the normal hiring and promotion practices of departments and other academic units. For example, the American Cultures

¹² Amalia Duarte, “Record Numbers of Women Earn Ph.D.s,” *Hispanic Outlook*, May 25, 2000, pp. 31-33.

¹³ Consult Professor Alice M. Agogino, U.C. Berkeley Department of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty Assistant to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and Director, Instructional Technology Program.

requirement has been cited as a nationwide model to enhance the teaching and learning of diverse perspectives about the American experience. Women and underrepresented minority faculty in many disciplines should be attracted to Berkeley because of this program. Yet too few faculty are aware of American Cultures, regularly teach courses that meet this requirement, or use the program as a basis for faculty recruitment and retention.

Because there is a widespread perception that diversity is “off the table” in light of the Regents’ resolutions, there is limited overt attention to the issue in many academic units. There is insufficient analysis to determine how well or how poorly units are promoting diversity, and there is no mechanism currently in place to provide incentives for units to enhance their diversity.

Beyond these constraints, there is a deeper attitudinal challenge at the faculty level. Although Berkeley's land-grant status and its stature as the leading public university are fully consistent with the goals of diversity, there is a disconnect between these lofty principles and faculty attitudes. Berkeley faculty value academic excellence above all else. This performance standard in turn is defined primarily by the quality of research as exemplified in peer-reviewed journals, monographs and books. Berkeley faculty see their scholarly reference points and their competition as coming largely from the most distinguished private universities, not from the public universities. For many on the Berkeley campus, “diversity” is perceived as a compromise with academic excellence or a “trade-off” between academic rigor and political correctness.

The Committee recognizes and endorses Berkeley’s emphasis on academic excellence. As a consequence, we think it would be naïve and indeed unrealistic in the extreme to believe that mere reliance on the good will of our colleagues, or well-meaning exhortations by academic administrators, will produce a major improvement in the diversity of the Berkeley faculty. Instead, “best practices” where diversity enhances academic excellence should be widely disseminated. This is easier done in the humanities and social sciences, where women and minorities often embrace and advance new fields of study, and more difficult in the natural sciences, the physical sciences, and engineering where scholarship is often seen as “color blind.” A “grow your own” philosophy could also be established in which the careers of women and minority Berkeley graduates in the professoriate are monitored, thereby facilitating their recruitment back to the campus when they have achieved scholarly distinction.

Concrete incentives must be provided to academic units to promote diversity. To have an impact, initiatives must be specifically tailored to individual units. In sum, steps to improve diversity on the campus, especially among the faculty, must and can be taken, but only with full recognition of the Berkeley culture that places primacy on scholarly distinction. Efforts to promote diversity at the expense of this norm, we believe, will be deeply resisted by the faculty and have little effect.

Staff recruitment and retention poses largely different challenges. Here much of the problem is a reflection of rapidly changing market conditions. To recruit and retain underrepresented minority staff is increasingly difficult, especially in technical and professional fields such as information technology, health, financial services and management. Current compensation, prospects for upward mobility, recruitment and hiring practices, and Berkeley’s image as an employer all militate against a more diverse work force.

It does appear, however, that one significant issue is within Berkeley's control. The workplace climate has been reported as "chilly" for minority staff. For example, in a recent examination of Black staff attitudes in the post-209 environment, the following conclusions were drawn:

- There is negative stereotyping of blacks by whites.
- Black staff receive inconsistent and unfair treatment.
- Black staff do not have sufficient access to training, development and promotional opportunities.
- Black staff sense an unsupportive work environment and a lack of respect and civility from their colleagues.
- Black staff believe that unfair hiring practices have been implemented in the post-209 environment.¹⁴

In addition, the inefficiencies and lack of timeliness in recruitment and selection processes erect barriers to attracting highly qualified minority and female applicants. Automation and streamlined employment processes are critical to the creation of a more welcoming environment for these job seekers. On balance, what is needed to improve both faculty and staff diversity are measures that alter the university culture so that diversity is increasingly understood and valued as a fundamental component of excellence.

Recommendations

The Committee offers four sets of recommendations in the following areas: organizational change; accountability; education and training; and data collection and analysis. Overall, the Committee believes that a broad-based approach is needed to enhance diversity at Berkeley. Initiatives taken at the senior management level and simultaneously within departments will reinforce each other; one without the other will have limited impact.

1. Organizational Change

It is vital for the campus leadership to signal that diversity is a top priority. This can take no more meaningful form than an infrastructure to support sustained efforts to promote faculty/staff equity and to incorporate this infrastructure into the Chancellor's cabinet. Moreover, the Committee believes that it is only through such an appointment that adequate resources will be made available for new and on-going programs and initiatives to promote diversity.

The Committee recommends that the current positions of Faculty Equity Associate, Staff Affirmative Action and Diversity Programs Director, Title IX compliance officers, and academic compliance affairs officer be incorporated into a unit devoted to faculty and staff equity. This unit would be headed by a new Vice Chancellor for Equity and Diversity (VCED) and would include support staff necessary to carry out the mission of the new Vice Chancellor position. The VCED would report to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP) and would work in close cooperation with the Academic Senate Committee on the Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities. This change in structure will enable the university to more effectively hold individuals throughout the campus accountable and provide the necessary visibility to promote campus-wide diversity initiatives. We see a close linkage between the activities of the VCED and the accountability function discussed below.

¹⁴ Report on Exploring the Impact of a Post-209 Environment: A Black Staff Dialogue, University of California, Berkeley, June 2000 (mimeo).

The responsibilities of the VCED would include:

- a. Coordinate regularly with department chairs, directors and deans to provide timely feedback on their efforts to build a diverse faculty and staff.
- b. Assess the practices of departments and schools, including procedures for mentoring junior faculty and developing and retaining a diverse staff.
- c. Identify and disseminate information about “best practices” diversity models that other units may seek to emulate.
- d. Provide input to the appointment of candidates to senior administrative positions.
- e. Oversee campus-wide efforts to promote faculty and staff diversity including the monitoring of women and minority Berkeley graduates in the professoriate who might be recruited back to the campus.
- f. Develop data collection and analytical systems to provide continuous monitoring of faculty and staff work force trends.
- g. Establish a campus website on faculty/staff diversity, highlighting best practices.
- h. Supervise a campus climate survey (discussed below) and other data collection efforts to assess faculty/staff diversity and equity.
- i. Use the results of the climate survey as a benchmark to issue an annual report that identifies the “10 best departments to work for at Berkeley” in which criteria devoted to diversity would be highlighted and promoted.
- j. Develop a staff career development program to promote retention of underrepresented minority staff.
- k. Provide enhanced budgetary support for units that are successful in women and minority recruitment and retention (see 2a. below).
- l. Work with the Vice Chancellor for University Relations to encourage the establishment of privately funded chairs to recruit women and minority faculty.

2. Accountability

No amount of energy at the campus level will be effective to promote diversity if changes are not felt directly at the “local” level where key personnel decisions are made. Faculty, department chairs, and deans must be held accountable for effective recruitment and promotion of women and minority faculty. The projections for several hundred new faculty hires in the next decade offer an opportunity to reverse the recent downward trend in the hiring of women and minorities. Directors, managers and supervisors should be responsible for promotion of staff diversity. We recommend that:

- a. Units be rewarded that have demonstrated success in enhancing faculty/staff diversity. For example, academic units successful in recruiting women and minority faculty could receive additional faculty lines or budgetary resources from the campus (subject to approval by the EVCP and the Committee on Planning and Budget) to cover the first two years of faculty salary for new hires, permitting them to use these funds for other needs. These rewards would be based on the recommendations of the VCED.
- b. Contributions to campus diversity be a criterion for appointment and retention of department chairs, deans, directors and senior managers. Note that these performance expectations are already written into policy for non-academic managers and supervisors, but they are not widely implemented. This expectation should be incorporated into the performance evaluation of all such personnel.
- c. Units that have a consistently poor record of recruiting women and minorities be highlighted by the VCED for special assistance. The VCED's office would assess the reasons for the record and offer information, recommendations and resources to improve it.

- d. A conscious effort be made to maintain diverse membership of key campus committees, especially the Committee on Planning and Budget, the Committee on Committees, and ad hoc promotion and tenure committees.

3. Education and Training

Personnel cannot be expected to promote diversity if they have limited knowledge of the issues or the means by which this objective can be implemented. Therefore, it is vital that education and training programs be initiated for faculty (especially department chairs), deans, search committees, members of the Committee on Planning and Budget, staff managers, and supervisors on the substantive issues associated with affirmative action, equal opportunity, and diversity.

We recommend that:

- a. Topics on affirmative action, equal opportunity and diversity be integrated into the campus leadership and management training programs (e.g., New Supervisor Labs, Leadership Development Program, Management Skills Assessment Program, Deans and Department Chairs Annual Retreat).
- b. The Interactive Theater Project be expanded campus-wide. In the spring 2000, a pilot program was launched in the College of Engineering (COE) that was highly successful. Interactive theater has been used as a tool to increase faculty awareness of diversity issues in the classroom while focusing on the impact of classroom equity and the “chilly” climate. Faculty felt strongly that the workshops provided the opportunity for them to reflect on how to foster an effective and inclusive learning environment and to conduct constructive dialogue with other colleagues about diversity issues in the College. (See Appendix V for a description of the Interactive Theater Project).

4. Data Collection and Analysis

Additional information is required, beyond what this Committee was able to collect, to assess comprehensively the current status of the diversity issue on campus and to identify constructive next steps. In particular, we recommend that four studies be undertaken:

- a. A survey of the current university “climate” for women and minorities. This survey would: provide insights on the challenges faced by faculty from underrepresented groups in developing a successful research and teaching agenda; offer needed information on the obstacles to the retention of staff from underrepresented groups; and document the main difficulties faced by department administration in recruiting and retaining faculty and staff. The survey could examine issues such as stopping the tenure clock for women faculty who give birth and providing time off for faculty for childcare. This is a substantial survey effort that should be carried out by an external group, perhaps modeled along the lines of the recent Peter Hart study conducted for the Vice Chancellor for University Relations.
- b. A study to address whether, and if so how, a diverse faculty can promote excellence in the natural sciences, the physical sciences and engineering. This study could be funded through the Center for Race and Gender.
- c. An assessment of the history of the implementation of the American Cultures requirement. Of particular interest are identification of the means to facilitate sustained faculty involvement, the research benefits of such involvement, and the positive effects on the student body.
- d. An examination of the effectiveness of staff recruitment and outreach in the Employment Unit in the Office of Human Resources.

It is anticipated that these research projects will identify problems with building a diverse campus community and how best to overcome them. These findings should be widely disseminated to foster dialogue on campus about diversity.

The recommendations in organizational change, accountability, and education and training cited above should be implemented without awaiting the outcome of these studies.

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Charge--Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Diversity

Appendix II: Members of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Diversity

**Appendix III: Speakers Who Addressed the Chancellor's Advisory
Committee on Diversity**

Appendix IV: Members of Sub-Committees

Appendix V: Interactive Theater Program

Appendix I: Charge--Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Diversity

Since the early 1960s, American higher education has been engaging issues of diversity with more deliberateness and vigor than at any time in American history. Among the many factors that contributed to this development, the Civil Rights Movement was probably the most powerful. It called urgent attention to the black/white racial divide in the country and prompted many historically white colleges and universities to commit themselves to a campaign to recruit, enroll and graduate much larger numbers of black students.

In the course of the last three decades, colleges and universities extended this resolve to redress inequities in educational opportunities for black students to students from other minority groups--particularly Chicanos and Native Americans. Demographic changes, particularly the increase in Asian American immigration, and a growing awareness of the multiple dimensions of diversity have deepened our understanding of social identity and the subtle forces that influence its construction.

Academic communities have learned that diversity is an educational opportunity and an educational asset. They have discovered new areas of inquiry, beginning with the simple question, "Who are they, and what has been their experience?" This question has created opportunities for intellectual engagement that can lead to increasingly sophisticated answers. It is now possible to explore in intellectually rigorous ways the social and cultural lives of groups whose experiences and contributions have long been neglected. The result is more knowledge and more pathways to knowledge, and more points of contrast and comparison, which have the potential to deepen our understanding of everything we know.

As the top-ranked public university in the nation, Berkeley has both a unique challenge and a unique responsibility. Our challenge is to compete successfully with the top private universities in the nation given our limited resources and conditions. Our unique responsibility is to nurture the public culture that is necessary for democratic self-governance. Toward that end, the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Diversity is charged to develop a set of recommendations, both long and short term, and strategic in nature, to sustain and promote diversity in all its manifestations on the Berkeley campus. It should begin by defining what diversity means now, and how it functions in an academic environment. The Committee should articulate the questions and the issues and the strategies for dealing with them. The University of California, in adopting Regents Resolution SP-1 and 2, did not alter the institution's commitment to diversity but the means available. The Committee is charged to develop a set of strategies that will be effective in the current environment to achieve the diversity we all value. The strategies may involve student recruitment, admission and retention; curriculum; faculty recruitment, promotion and retention; and staff recruitment, promotion and retention. The Committee should consider how its recommendations can be fully integrated into the university's mission of teaching and research and how they can be fully embraced by the larger community in which we live and work.

The Chancellor's Advisory Committee will be appointed for one year. I ask for a report by the end of the 1999-2000 academic year.

Appendix II: Members of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Diversity

Dean Michael Nacht (chair)

Goldman School of Public Policy

Professor Carlos Bustamante

Department of Physics

Professor Angela Harris

Boalt Hall School of Law

Regent Odessa Johnson

Modesto Junior College

Professor William Lester

College of Chemistry

Regent Irene Miura

San Jose State University

Ms. Edith Ng

Staff Affirmative Action Office

Professor Deborah Nolan

Department of Statistics

Ms. Jean Quan

Oakland Unified School District Board of Education

Ms. Lea Redmond

Graduate Student in African American Studies

Mr. Preston Taylor

Undergraduate Student

Associate Vice Chancellor Langston Trigg

Office of Capital Projects

Professor Charles P. Henry (Staff to Committee)

Department of African American Studies and
Faculty Equity Associate, Office of the Chancellor

**Appendix III: Speakers Who Addressed the Chancellor's Advisory
Committee on Diversity**

November 9, 1999 - Professor Robert Berdahl, Chancellor

December 8, 1999 - Ms. Sheila O'Rourke, Academic Compliance Officer

January 24, 2000 - Ms. Anita Madrid, Director, Berkeley Pledge; Ms. Pamela Burnett, Associate Director,
Office of Undergraduate Admission and Relations with Schools

February 28, 2000 - Professor John Dwyer, Chair, University wide Committee on Planning and Budget

March 29, 2000 - Professor James Anderson, North Carolina State University, consultant on diversity issues

April 3, 2000 - Professor Troy Duster, Director, Center for the Teaching and Study of American Cultures

April 3, 2000 - Professor Carol Christ, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

April 3, 2000 - Professor Nicholas Jewell, Vice Provost

April 24, 2000 - Ms. Renee Sung, Associate Dean, Graduate Division

Appendix IV: Members of Sub-Committees

I. Sub-Committee on Faculty Recruitment and Retention

Professor Deborah Nolan (chair)

Professor Carlos Bustamante

Professor Angela Harris

Professor William Lester

Ms. Lea Redmond

II. Sub-Committee on Staff Recruitment and Retention

Ms. Edith Ng (chair)

Regent Odessa Johnson

Regent Irene Miura

Ms. Jean Quan

Mr. Preston Taylor

Mr. Langston Trigg

Appendix V: Interactive Theater Program

INTERACTIVE THEATER PROGRAM

University of California, Berkeley

(April 2000)

Program Description

Interactive theater combines live performance and audience participation to help people examine human issues. Each workshop features trained actors in scenarios that vividly illustrate problematic encounters between individuals. When each scene is over, the actors remain in character as the audience, with the assistance of a facilitator, asks questions about the behavior, feelings, and motivations of each character. After the actors have been questioned, an open discussion allows audience members to identify with each character and discuss among themselves the causes and consequences of the problematic attitudes and behaviors represented in the scene.

Program Goal

Specifically, interactive theater has been used as a tool on college campuses to increase faculty awareness of gender and racial issues in the classroom while focusing on the impact of classroom equity and the "chilly" climate. This tool can also be applied to other environments such as student living and the workplace. The goals are to create campus climate change, improve the quality of teaching, enhance fairness in the workplace through increased awareness and behavior change among individuals, and build a more tolerant community among a diverse student body, staff and faculty.

The process allows participants to experience empathy for all of the characters, think through what actually happened, identify problems that may result, and consider solutions and strategies for prevention. Audience members experience a variety of emotions as they interact with the characters, ranging from sympathy to amusement to frustration and anger. "Interactive theater is a great way for people to confront sensitive issues in a non-threatening atmosphere. It touches them where they live. They see themselves and their responsibilities in the characters." (*Robert Young, Director of Diversity Initiatives, Eastman Kodak Company*)

Program Objectives

1. Increase empathy for multiple points of view.
2. Increase consciousness about issues of gender and racial equity and other dimensions of diversity.
3. Provide data on relevant issues.
4. Identify and promote new behaviors conducive to eliminating bias and increasing equity.
5. Promote on-going dialogue and support for program participants.

Background

In the spring of 1997, Carla Trujillo, Director of Higher Education in the Center for Underrepresented Students and Edith Ng, Director of Staff Affirmative Action and Diversity Programs attended an Interactive Theater training sponsored by The Sloan Foundation, and the Women Engineering Program Advocates Network at Cornell University. Carla and Edith returned from three days of intensive training and met with then-chair of the dramatic arts and dance department, Margaret Wilkerson, to discuss developing an interactive theater program on the Berkeley campus. We divided the project into three phases. Phase 1 would focus on problematic issues in the academic climate, including classroom and advising situations; Phase 2 would focus on campus climate; and Phase 3 would focus on workplace climate issues. Phases 2 and 3 would be developed only after Phase 1 success.

Pilot Program in the College of Engineering

A proposal to develop Phase I as a pilot program in the College of Engineering was submitted in December 1997. A two-year matching grant totaling \$73,000 was obtained from the Engineering Information Foundation. The target audience was faculty. The pilot program was created by a collaborative partnership between the College of Engineering, the Staff Affirmative Action Office and the Department of Dramatic Arts and Music. College of Engineering Professor Alice Agogino serves as the principal investigator. Carla Trujillo and Edith Ng are the co-coordinators of the program and Lura Dolas, from the Department of Dramatic Art and Music, is the theatrical director. The original project timeline was adjusted and program development began in Summer 1998.

The scenarios created are derived from research based on campus classroom climate surveys and faculty and student interviews conducted at the UC Berkeley College of Engineering. These scenarios vividly illustrate problematic encounters between professors and students, as well as between students themselves. A campus advisory committee was created to guide the project. Student and staff actors and faculty and staff facilitators were recruited for the project; all are volunteers. A two-hour workshop format was developed and the workshops were implemented in the College of Engineering in April 2000. During the course of the development of the pilot, a research partnership was established with CITE (Cornell Interactive Theater Ensemble) at Cornell University. Cornell has an institutionalized interactive theater program; the research partnership was established to assess the effectiveness of different interactive theater training models.

Future Plans

At this time, there is no commitment for continued funding beyond the pilot phase. Depending on the success of the pilot program, campus interest and funding, the creators of the program are interested in revision, replication and expansion of this model. Your input is welcome!