

**Inclusive & Thriving Campus
Community Committee (ITCC) of
Leading the Change:
The UC Santa Cruz Strategic Plan
Final Report and Recommendations**

April 21, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Committee Membership	2
Introduction	4
Executive Summary	5
Charge & Background	6
Charge	7
Background	7
Group A: Recruitment and Review	7
Group B: Professional Development and Accountability	8
Group C: DEI Inventory and Assessment	10
Group D: Community, State, and System Partnerships	11
Full Committee Meetings	12
Cross-Committee Collaboration	14
Goals	15
Charge 1: Evaluate and Learn from Our Peers	15
Charge 2: Inventory the Emerging Campus DEI Ecosystem	15
Charge 3: Take Stock of Non-Centralized DEI Efforts	16
Charge 4: Review and Recommend DEI-Related Trainings	16
Charge 5: Review and Recommend Best Practices in DEI	16
Charge 6: Propose Accountability and Implementation Frameworks	17
Charge 7: Improve Communication Flows at All Levels	17
Findings & Recommendations	18
ITCC Survey Data	18
Other ITCC Committee Findings	25
Group A (Charges 5 and 7)	27
Group B (Charges 4 and 6)	29
Group C (Charges 2 and 3)	34
Group D (Charge 1 and Additional Charges)	37
Conclusion	47
Appendix	50

INCLUSIVE & THRIVING CAMPUS COMMUNITY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Co-Chairs

Anju Reejsinghani, Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer

Celine Parreñas Shimizu, Dean of Arts and Distinguished Professor, Film and Digital Media

Members

Shiva Abbaszadeh, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Needhi Bhalla, Associate Professor, Molecular, Cell, & Developmental Biology; Faculty Equity Advocate, Physical and Biological Sciences

Jessica Bulleri, Campus Wellness Program Manager, Risk Services

Alvaro Cardenas, Associate Professor, Computer Science and Engineering; Faculty Equity Advocate, Engineering

Colette Chriqui Grey, Manager, Talent Acquisition, Staff Human Resources

Grace Peña Delgado, Associate Professor, History; Faculty Equity Advocate, Humanities

Angel Dominguez, Graduate Services Counselor, Student Achievement & Equity Innovation

Patty Gallagher, Professor, Performance, Play and Design; Chair, Academic Senate; Faculty Equity Advocate, Arts

Marcella Gomez, Associate Professor, Applied Mathematics; Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and Faculty Equity Advocate, Engineering

Adrienne Harrell, Executive Director and Senior Diversity Officer, UC Santa Cruz Foundation and University Relations

Karlton Hester, Professor, Music and Director of Jazz Studies; Director of Digital Arts and New Media and Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, Arts

Christine Hong, Chair, Critical Race and Ethnic Studies; Director, Center for Racial Studies and Associate Professor, Literature

Nancy Kim, Executive Director, Resource Centers

John Jota Leaños, Professor, Film and Digital Media; Faculty Equity Advocate, Arts

Herbie Lee, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Professor of Statistics

Heather Lefebvre, Human Resources Manager, ITS-Resource Planning & Management

Yat Li, Professor, Chemistry & Biochemistry

Judit Moschkovich, Professor, Education; Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and Faculty Equity Advocate, Social Sciences

Psi Padhya, SUA, undergraduate student representative

Ravi Rajan, Professor, Environmental Studies

Christina Ravelo, Distinguished Professor, Ocean Sciences; Associate Dean of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, Physical and Biological Sciences

Lenora Willis, Executive Director for African, Black, Caribbean Student Success

Administrative Support Staff

Asia Valdivia, Special Assistant and Project Manager, Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

INTRODUCTION

The Inclusive & Thriving Campus Community (ITCC) committee is one of five committees that form part of Leading the Change: The UC Santa Cruz Strategic Plan. As the committee that most directly centers principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) across lines of faculty, staff, students, and community members – along with upholding related concepts of belonging, access, justice, and wellbeing –, ITCC has an expansive seven-point charge. That charge touches nearly all members of our campus and local community including Senate and other faculty members, academic and nonacademic staff, graduate and undergraduate students, UCs and other higher education partners, and K-12 schools and community groups across the region.

As a result, co-chairs Parreñas Shimizu and Reejhsinghani (the latter mere days into her inaugural VC DEI role) had to make pressing decisions about which stakeholders to invite into our deliberative process and how. In shaping our committee membership, therefore, we prioritized inviting Associate Deans of DEI, Faculty Equity Advocates, senior leaders, faculty engaged in DEI-related research, advocacy, teaching, and governance, and members of Staff Human Resources, the Staff Advisory Board, Student Affairs and Success, Information Technology Services, the Student Union Assembly, and other entities that engage or collaborate in critical DEI-related work at a campuswide level. We did invite additional undergraduate and graduate students into our ranks but were hampered in recruiting them by a number of factors outside of our control, including an unprecedented series of storms, a UC Systemwide strike, and the lingering impacts of a pandemic that largely shuttered campus for two years.

Nonetheless, we persisted. Our methodology in developing findings and making recommendations has been to rely on stakeholder conversations, internal deliberations, survey data, and documentation, citing exemplars whenever possible. Working group findings and recommendations were developed through consensus. Our pace has been whirlwind; meetings were launched in November 2022 and ended in mid-April 2023. We welcomed additional voices, opinions, and corrections throughout the process and even into the final days, yet there may be unintentional omissions or other errors.

The narrative that follows is layered and slightly circuitous, similarly to our process of developing findings and recommendations collectively as a committee or in intense working group sessions. In addition to embedded sources, our appendix should help to illustrate our methods of discovery. Our goals are spotlighted in the Executive Summary, with recommendations available in recap form in the Conclusion. We are grateful to our committee members and look forward to robust campus discussions on the future implementation of our recommendations.

– Anju Reejhsinghani and Celine Parreñas Shimizu, April 2023

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

What key priorities in diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) should UC Santa Cruz embrace over the next decade? What steps are we already taking to make these priorities a reality? What equity gaps currently exist, and what tangible, actionable steps can we take to help close them? These and numerous other questions animated the Inclusive & Thriving Campus Community (ITCC) committee discussions during our planning and stakeholder conversations in academic year 2022-2023. After consulting survey data, stakeholders in dozens of units and all divisions, and the internal and external reports available to us, ITCC has developed a number of recommendations that we hope will underlie our next steps regarding DEI on our campus. This report breaks down the goals and recommendations of our committee across a seven-point charge. A highlight of some key priorities (“goals”) is as follows, although many additional recommendations are available in the body of this report.

Charge 1: Evaluate and Learn from Our Peers

- Expand community building initiatives on and off campus
- Strengthen regional pipelines from the university to larger community
- Center inclusivity when supporting communities (“nothing about us without us”)

Charge 2: Inventory the Emerging Campus DEI Ecosystem

- Bolster ODEI and divisional DEI roles and offices
- Develop a pilot for and launch a campuswide DEI inventory tool
- Build DEI inventorying and assessment into the DEI strategic planning process

Charge 3: Take Stock of Non-Centralized DEI Efforts

- Increase data gathering and analytic capacity in ODEI
- Strengthen efforts to build community by addressing existing gaps in services

Charge 4: Review and Recommend DEI-Related Trainings

- Identify the curriculum and roadmap for the campus under ODEI stewardship
- Improve coordination, transparency, clarity and alignment of DEI expectations

Charge 5: Review and Recommend Best Practices in DEI

- Scale up approaches to inclusive hiring and extend to student employees
- Prioritize recruitment and retention of marginalized faculty and staff
- Build on existing mentoring programs for underrepresented faculty and staff

Charge 6: Propose Accountability and Implementation Frameworks

- Integrate roadmap to embed DEI into the culture
- Adequately staff compliance and climate units and expand collaboration
- While respecting compliance processes, uphold transparency whenever possible

Charge 7: Improve Communication Flows at All Levels

- Improve review/appraisal processes for faculty and staff

CHARGE & BACKGROUND

Charge

The Inclusive & Thriving Campus Community committee seeks to embed principles of diversity, equity and inclusion because we aspire to extraordinary outcomes in research, scholarship and creative activities, teaching, and other related pursuits. The committee has worked to create opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to discuss how the campus should approach improving the diversity, equity, and inclusivity of our campus as reflected in its overall climate over the next decade.

The ITCC charge is as follows:

Charge 1: Evaluate and learn from our UC peers, CSUs, community colleges, and other public education institutions in California and nationwide.

Charge 2: Inventory the emerging campus ecosystem of units and leaders for equity, belonging, and inclusion, including the Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion; Equity and Equal Protection; Academic Personnel Office; Hate/Bias Response Team; and the newly established Ombuds Office, and propose recommendations to address real and perceived institutional, programmatic, and other equity-related gaps as well as cultures of exclusion.

Charge 3: Take stock of the DEI committees, positions, leaders and other initiatives (including grant-funded) that have developed outside of central campus offices. Evaluate effectiveness and make recommendations about how to leverage, amplify, and support this work.

Charge 4: Review current required and optional DEI-related training for students, faculty, instructors, teaching assistants, and other academic and non-academic staff and make recommendations for improvements and needed resources.

Charge 5: Review and recommend best practices to improve diversity (in all its facets) in faculty, staff and student hiring in consultation with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Faculty Equity Advocates, and Staff Human Resources, among others.

Charge 6: Propose mechanisms to conduct larger campus conversations and action plans to ensure an inclusive campus community, recommend clearer pathways to support those experiencing non-inclusive behaviors, and hold each member of our community accountable to our values in the face of ruptures.

Charge 7: Improve communication flows at departmental, divisional and campus levels on the importance of contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion and inclusive teaching, especially concerning the transparency of their value in the merit review process.

Background

Our committee intentionally reached out to our stakeholders to include them in the committee itself (e.g., Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Associate Deans for DEI, Faculty Equity Advocates, shared governance representatives, and representatives from Division of Student Affairs and Success (DSAS), Staff Advisory Board (SAB), Instructional Technological Services (ITS), Staff Human Resources (SHR), and other units), thus ensuring that we had a diverse pool of members who are already doing key DEI work in their classrooms, departments, divisions, and in the community. We broke our seven-point charge down into subcharges assigned to one of four working groups.

While most of our stakeholder meetings took place at the working group level to facilitate intimate conversation and ease of scheduling, we also held four stakeholder meetings across all working groups with the Associate Deans of DEI, Faculty Equity Advocates, Special Advisor to the Chancellor on Indigenous Relations, and the Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. The ITCC co-chairs also participated in an additional cross-committee strategic planning meeting on Native American/Indigenous issues.

Group A: Recruitment and Review

Charge:

- **Charge 5:** Review and recommend best practices to improve diversity (in all its facets) in faculty, staff and student hiring in consultation with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Faculty Equity Advocates, and Staff Human Resources, among others.
- **Charge 7:** Improve communication flows at departmental, divisional and campus levels on the importance of contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion and inclusive teaching, especially concerning the transparency of their value in the merit review process.

Membership:

Herbie Lee, liaison to Steering Committee
Jessica Bulleri
Patty Gallagher
Colette Chriqui Grey
Judith Moschkovich
Christina Ravelo

Background:

Group A had seven small group meetings in addition to the work time at ITCC full group meetings. Some key stakeholders were already group members, particularly around faculty recruitment and review and staff recruitment and review, so the group only invited two additional stakeholders for discussions: Conra Frazier, AVC and EEO Director, and Veronica Heiskell, Associate Director of Experiential Learning & Student Employment.

Group A had extensive discussions of the principles that should orient this work and drive the implementation of its strategic planning recommendations:

1. Connect to campus values: Ensure that hiring and review/appraisal guidelines are aligned with the campus vision and that DEI contributions are included in hiring and reviews/appraisals
2. Connect to research: use and build on research-based best practices
3. Provide training, time to learn, and resources:
 - a. Provide written materials and make them easily accessible and searchable
 - b. Provide multiple opportunities and settings for discussion (e.g., scenarios, small groups, long term study groups, reflection, and self-improvement)
 - c. Provide sufficient resources (e.g., funding, time, staffing, organizational support, professional facilitation, and consultation with APO/SHR)
4. Regularly revisit and assess how the improvement process moves forward

The group reviewed a number of examples of recommendations, plans, procedures, and guidelines. (Exemplars for hiring and review are included in the Appendix.) Our

campus does not currently have a robust process for review of student employees, so Group A focused only on student hiring.

Group B: Professional Development and Accountability

Charge:

- **Charge 4:** Review current required and optional DEI-related training for students, faculty, instructors, teaching assistants, and other academic and non-academic staff and make recommendations for improvements and needed resources.
- **Charge 6:** Propose mechanisms to conduct larger campus conversations and action plans to ensure an inclusive campus community, recommend clearer pathways to support those experiencing non-inclusive behaviors, and hold each member of our community accountable to our values in the face of ruptures.

Membership:

Adrienne Harrell, liaison to Steering Committee

Angel Dominguez

Heather Lefebvre

Karlton Hester

Lenora Willis

Psi Padhya

Background and Principles:

Group B believes that the commitment to an inclusive community should be expressed as a core institutional value that infuses and reflects the everyday lived experiences of every student, staff and faculty member. Using surveys, stakeholder conversations, and other mechanisms to inform our assessment of and recommendations regarding DEI training opportunities, Group B feels that UC Santa Cruz must focus on improving the lived experiences of all of our members in keeping with our Principles of Community.

Group B identified DEI-related training opportunities available to students, faculty and staff and prioritized key stakeholders to interview. Of the latter, Group B met with members of the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL), and Graduate Student Support.

During this data gathering process, Professor Enrico Ramirez-Ruiz shared with them the mission and values statement for the Center for Reimagining Leadership, which they use with his permission to define “accountability.”

Accountability: hold ourselves and others responsible for both amplifying the voices, needs and opportunities of those with less privilege and power, and for ensuring work is undertaken to eliminate structural inequities. Demonstrated accountability must be structural, data-driven, and site-specific, and include active learning and listening opportunities.

Though it feels more comfortable framing them as “steps” rather than “goals,” Group B supports the following:

1. Identify the curriculum and roadmap for the campus under the stewardship of the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
2. Improve coordination, transparency, clarity and alignment of DEI expectations and opportunities
3. Integrate roadmap in order to embed DEI into the culture

Group C: DEI Inventory and Assessment

Charge:

- **Charge 2:** Inventory the emerging campus ecosystem of units and leaders for equity, belonging, and inclusion, including the Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion; Equity and Equal Protection; Academic Personnel Office; Hate/Bias Response Team; and the newly established Ombuds Office, and propose recommendations to address real and perceived institutional, programmatic, and other equity-related gaps as well as cultures of exclusion.
- **Charge 3:** Take stock of the DEI committees, positions, leaders and other initiatives (including grant-funded) that have developed outside of central campus offices. Evaluate effectiveness and make recommendations about how to leverage, amplify, and support this work.

Membership:

Anju Reejhsinghani, liaison to Steering Committee
Shiva Abbaszadeh
Marcella Gomez
Nancy Kim
John Jota Leaños
Yat Li

Background:

On March 12, Group C met with Dr. Ropers, the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs at the University of Minnesota. Her ACE fellowship brought her to Macalester College in St. Paul, Minnesota, last fall and to UC Santa Cruz this winter and spring quarter. Dr. Ropers offered insight into the kinds of DEI structures she has found most effective and what to prioritize as we develop a campuswide DEI strategic plan.

In addition to meeting with stakeholders, Group C held planning meetings to assist VC DEI Reejhsinghani in revising a CAAD document inventorying DEI-centered programs, centers, units, scholarships, and other resources on campus. VC Reejhsinghani used the revised CAAD document to respond to a survey coordinated by UCoP due on March 1. The EDI Framework survey tasked Vice Chancellors for DEI throughout the state with documenting campus-specific DEI resources in keeping with President Drake's [strategic priorities](#) – in particular, “Strengthening an inclusive, respectful and safe university community.” (The document is not meant to be exhaustive and will likely be updated before submission to President Drake this summer.)

Group D: Community, State, and System Partnerships

Charge:

- **Charge 1:** Evaluate and learn from our UC peers, CSUs, community colleges, and other public education institutions in California and nationwide.

Membership:

Celine Parreñas Shimizu, liaison to Steering Committee
Needhi Bhalla
Alvaro Cardenas
Christine Hong
Grace Peña Delgado
Ravi Rajan

Background:

The Community, State, and System Partnerships group (Group D) of the Inclusive and Thriving Campus Community committee was tasked with evaluating UC Santa Cruz's internal Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) efforts in dialogue with external initiatives, such as systemwide efforts and those conducted by public educational institutions in California and nationwide. Our intention has been to carry out this work with an eye toward addressing real and perceived institutional, programmatic, and other equity-related gaps and cultures of exclusion.

The group prioritized internal and external stakeholders based on their potential impact on achieving the group's charge. In addition to the larger ITCC stakeholder meetings, the group consulted with the Community Faculty Network chairs, representatives from the UC Office of the President Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) Initiative, and (in coordination with the AAPI Faculty Network) UCLA's former Inaugural Dean of DEI, Jerry Kang. As with other groups in ITCC, Group D is comprised of stakeholders already engaged in leading initiatives, developing metrics, and setting goals across campus related to our charge – specifically, the Arts Dean, the CRES Department Chair/ Director of Center for Racial Justice, FEAs, and other key faculty members.

It is important to note that the group defines community broadly, extending beyond the campus boundaries to the regions in which we live and the communities we invite to campus with a vision for imagining and achieving true inclusion and belonging. We believe it is critical that our campus work more closely to substantively integrate the broader campus community into the campus culture and life. This perspective infuses our work and our findings.

UCSC's community extends beyond its campus borders, encompassing not only students, faculty, and staff as well as the surrounding local community, alumni, industry partners, and various other stakeholders. This broad understanding of community recognizes the interdependence between UCSC and its wider network and the need for collaboration and engagement to create forward progress and change. DEI is vital in shaping this vision of the university-community, as these values are critical to fostering a culture of belonging, support, and mutual respect required in our shared mission. (See Appendix for the full definition.)

By integrating DEI values into every aspect of campus and surrounding communities, UCSC creates a vibrant and dynamic environment that supports the success of all its members. This inclusive approach will enhance the educational experience for UCSC

students, faculty, and staff. It will contribute to the overall well-being and resilience of the local and global communities through which UCSC interacts and intersects.

Full Committee Meetings

The ITCC committee held stakeholder meetings attended by members from all four working groups: (1) Special Advisor to the Chancellor on Indigenous Relations, (2) Associate Deans of DEI, (3) Faculty Equity Advocates (FEAs), and (4) Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice Chancellor for DEI. (A full list of stakeholder meetings is in the Appendix.) The following is a brief summary of these meetings.

A founding faculty member at UC Merced, Professor Matlock joined UC Santa Cruz in January 2023 for a six-month, half-time appointment as Special Advisor to the Chancellor on Indigenous Relations. She has been working with a number of campus and community members to gain a better awareness of existing relationships with the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band and of Native/Indigenous student, staff, and faculty needs. Her visit to ITCC came shortly after her appointment, serving to launch larger questions about how our campus can and should support Native/Indigenous community members – a conversation that ITCC co-chairs Parreñas Shimizu and Reejhsinghani continued in concert with Leading the Change’s Climate Change, Sustainability and Resilience Committee, the chairs and members of the UC Santa Cruz Indigenous Faculty Network, and other involved community members.

In recent years, each academic division has appointed Associate Deans of DEI, for a total of five. They include Gina Dent in Humanities, Marcella Gomez in Engineering, Karlton Hester in Arts, Judit Moschkovich in Social Sciences and Christina Ravelo in Physical and Biological Sciences. (All but Dent are members of ITCC.) Beginning in Winter 2023, the Associate Deans for DEI have been meeting twice quarterly with the VC and AVC of ODEI to coordinate efforts across campus and systemwide. They shared their perspectives with us on February 21.

In 2022, the campus launched the Faculty Equity Advocates (FEAs) program. Funded by the Advancing Faculty Diversity program of the University of California Office of the President, the FEAs program is a vital initiative to increase faculty diversity and inclusivity through a dual emphasis on recruitment and retention. The program includes ten faculty members, with two representatives from each of the five divisions: Arts, Engineering, Humanities, Physical and Biological Sciences and Social Sciences. Seven of the ten FEAs are members of ITCC. Two currently hold both Associate Dean of DEI and FEA titles: Marcella Gomez in Engineering and Judit Moschkovich in Social Sciences. FEAs have distinct responsibilities, with one subgroup in each division

focusing on equitable hiring practices and the other concentrating on cultivating a positive climate and retention. In some cases, FEAs engage in aspects of both roles. Beginning in Winter 2023, they have been meeting twice quarterly with the VC DEI to coordinate efforts across campus and systemwide. The full ITCC committee met with the FEAs on March 7.

The full committee met with VC DEI Reejhsinghani and AVC DEI Judith Estrada on April 18. The VC and AVC discussed projected future goals for the office and ways in which it can continue to collaborate with partners on and off campus. In particular, they stressed the need for more data collection and assessment around DEI education needs and advocated for greater collaboration with units across campus to ensure a quick transition to the implementation of ITCC goals and recommendations.

Cross-Committee Collaboration

On March 9, the ITCC Co-Chairs and Administrative Staff Support met with UCSC Indigenous Staff and Faculty Stakeholders in collaboration with the Climate Change, Sustainability and Resilience (CCSR) Committee. The focus of this meeting was on cross-committee collaborations supporting our Indigenous/Native American community members, including the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band (AMTB).

GOALS

For ease of reading, we have set our goals out in this section, aligning them to the working group narratives (“Findings and Recommendations”) that follow.

Charge 1: Evaluate and learn from our UC peers, CSUs, community colleges, and other public education institutions in California and nationwide.

Goals:

- Support community-building events such as public fora, town halls and leadership councils that bring our university leadership, faculty, staff and students together. (Suggested by Group D)
- Support pipeline projects that connect the university with regional and local communities. (Suggested by Group D)
- Center inclusivity in building relations with marginalized communities (“nothing about us without us”). (Suggested by Group D)

Charge 2: Inventory the emerging campus ecosystem of units and leaders for equity, belonging, and inclusion, including the Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion; Equity and Equal Protection; Academic Personnel Office; Hate/Bias Response Team; and the newly established Ombuds Office, and propose recommendations to address real and perceived institutional, programmatic, and other equity-related gaps as well as cultures of exclusion.

Goals:

- Bolster ODEI and divisional DEI roles and offices, growing their capacity to collaborate with campus partners and serve as a nexus for campuswide and divisional DEI efforts, respectively. (Suggested by Group D)
- Develop a pilot DEI inventory tool for use by select staff, faculty, and students and work with CAAD, SAB, SUA, GSA, and other units to launch it in future years. (Suggested by Group C)
- Build DEI inventorying and assessment into the DEI strategic planning process. (Suggested by Group C)

Charge 3: Take stock of the DEI committees, positions, leaders and other initiatives (including grant-funded) that have developed outside of central campus offices. Evaluate effectiveness and make recommendations about how to leverage, amplify, and support this work.

Goals:

- Increase data gathering and analytic capacity in ODEI to ensure close collaboration with IRAPS and academic, staff, and student units moving forward in developing and assessing DEI work. (Suggested by Group C)
- Strengthen efforts to build community by addressing existing gaps in services. (Suggested by Group C)

Charge 4: Review current required and optional DEI-related training for students, faculty, instructors, teaching assistants, and other academic and non-academic staff and make recommendations for improvements and needed resources.

- Identify the curriculum and roadmap for the campus under the stewardship of the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. (Suggested by Group B)
- Improve coordination, transparency, clarity and alignment of DEI expectations and opportunities (Suggested by Group B)

Charge 5: Review and recommend best practices to improve diversity (in all its facets) in faculty, staff and student hiring in consultation with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Faculty Equity Advocates, and Staff Human Resources, among others.

Goals:

- Improve hiring practices for faculty, staff, and students to be more aligned with research-based best practices for inclusion and fairness. (Suggested by Group A)
- Increase the recruitment and retention of underrepresented faculty and staff, including faculty of color, women, disabled and LGBTQ+ individuals to represent the demographics of the state as is the stated goal of UCSC administration by 2030. (Suggested by Group D)

- Create comprehensive mentorship programs to support the retention of underrepresented faculty and staff. (Suggested by Group D)

Charge 6: Propose mechanisms to conduct larger campus conversations and action plans to ensure an inclusive campus community, recommend clearer pathways to support those experiencing non-inclusive behaviors, and hold each member of our community accountable to our values in the face of ruptures.

Goals:

- Integrate roadmap in order to embed DEI into the culture (Suggested by Group B)
- Ensure that the processes for reporting incidents, investigating complaints, and addressing incidents of discrimination and harassment are addressed with adequate resources for these offices so they are timely and comprehensive. (Suggested by Group D)
- Share the overall picture of campus climate without breaking the required confidentiality within these offices and commit to improving these processes based on the reports. (Suggested by Group D)

Charge 7: Improve communication flows at departmental, divisional and campus levels on the importance of contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion and inclusive teaching, especially concerning the transparency of their value in the merit review process.

- Improve review/appraisal practices for faculty and staff to be more equitable, transparent, and consistent across time and settings, and, in particular, to improve how contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) are documented, assessed, and recognized. (Suggested by Group A)

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

ITCC Survey Data

Findings: The Leading the Change survey data for ITCC offer some useful insights for campus priorities in the DEI space, although they are most helpful in orienting faculty priorities and viewpoints given the high faculty response rate. Nonetheless, we can discern some key trends that are worth highlighting.

The survey methodology is slightly different than we had originally envisioned when we began the process last fall. When we first developed the survey, we had expected participants to rank up to 10 priorities in order of importance, but this was later changed to selecting up to 5 of the 10 priorities in unranked order. We agree that this modification made sense given that it likely reduced response time for the ITCC portion of the survey, and it was in place by our December progress report.

Since then, IRAPS further suggested we limit respondents to only two questions about priorities. Faculty were asked about faculty, staff about staff, and students about students, but each category of respondent was also asked about only one other group instead of both. This was less impactful when surveying faculty (active Senate faculty had the highest response rate at 53%) or staff (the nonacademic staff response rate was 36% and the academic staff response rate was 20%), but it was important when surveying students. Because graduate students had a response rate of 15% and undergraduates 8%, approximately half of each group were asked about faculty and half about staff. So it is difficult to ascertain whether student feelings about staff and faculty DEI priorities truly represent the swath of student opinion on campus.

That said, we believe the data has general validity as a tool to develop more nuanced survey instruments in the future to gain more finely grained views on marginalized population experiences, needs and priorities. (Note: “n” below indicates the number of total respondents.) The responses we did receive indicated the following student-focused priorities among four key groups (undergraduates, graduate students, staff, and faculty):

Q: Which of the following strategies should UC Santa Cruz focus on to become a more inclusive and welcoming place for STUDENTS? Select up to 5 priorities.

Responses from undergraduates that were at least 25% (n = 1,240):

- Help low-income and minoritized students access community resources (66%)
- Expand on-campus mental health services (57%)
- Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for students with disabilities (48%)

- Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for students of color¹ (48%)
- Provide additional academic advising services (41%)
- Commemorate major world holidays, festivals, and heritage celebrations (33%)

Responses from graduate students that were at least 25% (n = 272):

- Help low-income and minoritized students access community resources (64%)
- Expand on-campus mental health services (52%)
- Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for students of color (47%)
- Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for students with disabilities (46%)
- Provide additional academic advising services (33%)

Responses from staff that were at least 25% (n = 586):

- Help low-income and minoritized students access community resources (66%)
- Expand on-campus mental health services (61%)
- Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for students of color (50%)
- Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for students with disabilities (48%)
- Provide additional academic advising services (39%)
- Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for LGBTQ+ students (25%)

Responses from faculty that were at least 25% (n = 251):

- Help low-income and minoritized students access community resources (67%)
- Expand on-campus mental health services (62%)
- Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for students of color (54%)
- Provide additional academic advising services (43%)
- Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for students with disabilities (41%)

There were many similarities across groups – for instance, all four demonstrated over 60% support for “Help low-income and minoritized students access community resources.” Yet it is notable that only undergraduates voiced at least threshold 25% support for “Commemorate major world holidays, festivals, and heritage celebrations” (at 33%). These celebrations may be more meaningful for undergraduates, who likely derive more of their social involvement on campus, than for graduate students, staff, and faculty. There may also be differences in holidays and occasions celebrated based on the demographics of our undergraduate student body, which is the most racially and ethnically diverse of the four groups surveyed (undergrads, grads, staff, and faculty).

¹ “Faculty of color,” “staff of color,” and “students of color” were not defined for respondents, allowing them to decide for themselves how to interpret those terms. Similarly, no definitions were provided for “LGBTQ+,” “disabilities,” “minoritized,” “low-income,” and other terms that are commonly used in DEI circles but may be less familiar to some survey takers.

Moreover, faculty demonstrated less support for “Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for students with disabilities” (41%) than undergraduates (48%), graduate students (46%), and staff (48%). This may indicate that faculty are feeling relatively less inclined than other groups to support additional measures to accommodate students with disabilities – perhaps after having taken measures to make their teaching more accessible during the pandemic –, though more evidence would be needed to support that. (It’s also possible that faculty by and large do support taking those measures but felt other priorities were more salient given the limit on choosing no more than five.)

While the percentage of undergraduate and graduate students selecting “Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for students of color” is lower (48% and 47%, respectively) than for faculty (54%) and staff (50%), it is difficult to ascertain whether this may be partially due to the fact that student survey respondents skewed whiter than the overall student population. (Our undergraduate population is 32% white non-Hispanic, but the undergraduate survey respondents were 38% white non-Hispanic.) As is well known, UC Santa Cruz is both an HSI (Hispanic Serving Institution) and an AANAPISI (Asian American, Pacific Islander, and Native American Serving Institution), so there may also be perceptions among some of our students that the campus is already sufficiently welcoming to students of color. If that is the case, more exploration around what it means to be Hispanic and AAPI “enrolling” versus “serving” might be worth doing as we seek additional funding in those spaces. (Due to space limitations, we were unable to disaggregate “students of color” into subgroups.)

Finally, only staff selected “Make campus more inclusive and welcoming for LGBTQ+ students” at the minimum 25% threshold, and then only at 25%. This may indicate that the campus community as a whole feels secure that LGBTQ+ students are already well integrated into the community, whether or not that perception is accurate for all members of the LGBTQ+ student community. This data point may also represent an area of concern for those working with more vulnerable LGBTQ+ students (such as those who are also first-gen, unhoused, members of other marginalized groups, etc.) about the need to do more advocacy around building greater cultures of support.

When priorities for faculty and staff are taken into account, we also see some variation in priorities:

Q: Which of the following strategies should UC Santa Cruz focus on to become a more inclusive and welcoming place for STAFF? Select up to 5 priorities.

Responses from staff that were at least 25% (n = 1,104):

- Recruit and retain more staff of color (54%)

- Build stronger collaborative efforts among faculty and staff, including in shared governance committees, around diversity, equity, and inclusion (50%)
- Develop more staff resources and systems of accountability to handle conflict in the workforce (42%)
- Develop more training for staff in diversity, equity, and inclusion principles (38%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (36%)
- Recruit and retain more staff with disabilities (36%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ staff (29%)

Responses from undergraduates that were at least 25% (n = 572):

- Recruit and retain more staff of color (52%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (50%)
- Develop more training for staff in diversity, equity, and inclusion principles (47%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ staff (40%)
- Recruit and retain more staff with disabilities (37%)

Responses from graduate students that were at least 25% (n = 141):

- Recruit and retain more staff of color (60%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (55%)
- Develop more training for staff in diversity, equity, and inclusion principles (48%)
- Recruit and retain more staff with disabilities (48%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ staff (41%)

Responses from faculty that were at least 25% (n = 204):

- Recruit and retain more staff of color (59%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (41%)
- Recruit and retain more staff with disabilities (40%)
- Develop more training for staff in diversity, equity, and inclusion principles (36%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ staff (36%)

It is notable that staff had the least uniform responses of all groups, selecting seven of ten priorities at the 25%+ threshold. Faculty (36%) and staff (38%) also demonstrated less interest in prioritizing staff training in DEI principles than undergraduates (47%) and graduate students (48%). This reads as something of a disconnect, perhaps partially generational, between what staff and faculty view as necessary levels of competence in DEI principles for staff versus what current students do.

These results lead us to conclude that more research is needed to gauge and assess levels of understanding of, and support for, expanding DEI education on our campus. A fuller exploration would need to evaluate the percentage of our workforce that has taken

part in it and where – through ODEI, SHR, or other campus units, as part of professional or graduate education, and/or through other means. A more meaningful strategy around DEI education would also need to develop effective assessment tools and wrestle with how participation in DEI training should be incorporated into evaluation processes.

Finally, survey responses on DEI priorities for faculty indicate other areas of divergence:

Q: Which of the following strategies should UC Santa Cruz focus on to become a more inclusive and welcoming place for FACULTY? Select up to 5 priorities.

Responses from all Senate faculty (n = 326):

- Recruit and retain more faculty of color (64%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (39%)
- Build stronger collaborative efforts among faculty and staff, including in shared governance committees, around diversity, equity, and inclusion (33%)
- Recruit and retain more faculty with disabilities (32%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ faculty (29%)
- Develop more faculty resources and systems of accountability to handle conflict in the workforce (29%)

Responses from Senate faculty in the Arts (n = 35):

- Recruit and retain more faculty of color (80%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ faculty (54%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (51%)
- Recruit and retain more faculty with disabilities (46%)
- Build stronger collaborative efforts among faculty and staff, including in shared governance committees, around diversity, equity, and inclusion (43%)
- Develop more faculty resources and systems of accountability to handle conflict in the workforce (37%)
- Develop more training for faculty in diversity, equity, and inclusion principles (29%)

Responses from Senate faculty in the Humanities (n = 58):

- Recruit and retain more faculty of color (81%)
- Build stronger collaborative efforts among faculty and staff, including in shared governance committees, around diversity, equity, and inclusion (43%)
- Recruit and retain more faculty with disabilities (40%)
- Develop more faculty resources and systems of accountability to handle conflict in the workforce (34%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (31%)

- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ faculty (28%)

Responses from Senate faculty in the Social Sciences (n = 80):

- Recruit and retain more faculty of color (73%)
- Recruit and retain more faculty with disabilities (38%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (36%)
- Provide additional language interpretation and translation services (33%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ faculty (28%)

Responses from Physical and Biological Sciences faculty (n = 96):

- Recruit and retain more faculty of color (57%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (43%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ faculty (31%)
- Build stronger collaborative efforts among faculty and staff, including in shared governance committees, around diversity, equity, and inclusion (29%)
- Develop more faculty resources and systems of accountability to handle conflict in the workforce (28%)
- Recruit and retain more faculty with disabilities (25%)

Responses from Engineering faculty (n = 57):

- Recruit and retain more faculty of color (35%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (35%)
- Build stronger collaborative efforts among faculty and staff, including in shared governance committees, around diversity, equity, and inclusion (33%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ faculty (26%)
- Develop more training for faculty in diversity, equity, and inclusion principles (25%)

Responses from undergraduates (n = 650):

- Recruit and retain more faculty of color (57%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (55%)
- Develop more training for faculty in diversity, equity, and inclusion principles (53%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ faculty (45%)
- Recruit and retain more faculty with disabilities (43%)

Responses from graduate students (n = 129):

- Recruit and retain more faculty of color (63%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (53%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ faculty (48%)

- Recruit and retain more faculty with disabilities (47%)
- Develop more training for faculty in diversity, equity, and inclusion principles (47%)

Responses from staff (n = 530):

- Recruit and retain more faculty of color (58%)
- Hire and retain more women in positions of leadership at all levels (49%)
- Develop more training for faculty in diversity, equity, and inclusion principles (49%)
- Recruit and retain more faculty with disabilities (44%)
- Recruit and retain more LGBTQ+ faculty (42%)

Not included in the above statistics in the interest of space are survey data for lecturers and emeriti faculty. However, some key trends do emerge.

Faculty in different divisions reflect varying levels of support for DEI priorities, from a high of 81% and 80% among Humanities and Arts Senate faculty, respectively, for recruiting and retaining more faculty of color to a low of 35% among Engineering faculty. Yet despite these large disparities, all Senate faculty selected that goal as their highest DEI priority.

Approximately half of responding undergraduate students, graduate students, and staff believe that faculty should gain more training in DEI principles; the percentages are far lower for Senate faculty (22% among all Senate faculty, with a low of 14% among Humanities Senate faculty and a high of 29% among Arts Senate faculty). This indicates a clear reluctance among active Senate faculty – as well as Emeriti and Lecturers – to prioritize new or additional DEI training for faculty. Regardless of what lies behind this reluctance (a subject further worth exploring), it is clearly something that the campus must reckon with if we are to develop more relevant, cohort-based training modules intended for faculty to gain additional expertise that will enable them to be more effective instructors and mentors for a rapidly diversifying student body and junior faculty pool.

Recommendations: Because of the limited survey instrument (no more than 3 questions, no more than 5 priorities selected, no ability to rank priorities, questions written by committee consensus without the assistance of a data analyst, etc.) as well as the low response rate among certain populations, the survey results are more suggestive than authoritative. The sheer volume of qualitative data – uncoupled from demographic information beyond the categories of faculty, staff, etc. – may muddy the analytical waters further. (A full evaluation of the qualitative data is beyond the scope of

this report.) Yet the data offers tantalizing glimpses of some uniformity, along with some disjunctions, on DEI priorities among and within staff, undergraduate, graduate, and Senate faculty populations. A dedicated DEI climate survey of each of these populations – conducted by ODEI and IRAPs in collaboration with other campus units – might provide a way to delve deeper into the nuances of these responses.

Other ITCC Committee Findings

Findings: The full ITCC committee had four groups of stakeholders, including the Associate Deans of DEI, that impacted the scope of recommendations in this report. Additionally, the ITCC co-chairs attended a meeting with stakeholders supporting the Native American/Indigenous community on and off campus. (See list of stakeholder meetings in Appendix.) We have chosen to highlight these two meetings to demonstrate how we reached some of the recommendations in this report.

Associate Deans of DEI

Four of the five Associate Deans of DEI met with the full ITCC committee on February 21. They discussed the different processes and timelines by which they had been appointed to their positions. Some were in their first year in the role; others planned to step off at the end of this academic year. While some were engaged in data collection and assessment, others were primarily working on collaborating with partners inside and outside the division to improve climate. (As VC DEI Reejhsinghani noted, the wide variations in these roles and their wide scopes of work deserve a larger data gathering process that remains outside the scope of the current ITCC charge but may be possible with ODEI assistance next academic year.) The conversation with the Associate Deans brought up many salient issues, including:

- The need to align personnel review with campus’s shifting mission, including rethinking or broadening the “buckets” of teaching, scholarship and service that impact the review process
- Recognizing variations in academic divisions among departments that skew more female and/or nonwhite versus those that skew more male and/or white, and what those differences may mean for overall divisional demographics
- The cost of invisible labor to faculty of color, women, and other marginalized groups, especially teaching faculty

- Challenging assumptions about faculty in certain divisions or disciplines as being less invested and competent in DEI matters
- Developing new processes to review community-engaged scholarship while respecting differences across divisions
- Shifting language away from an “underrepresentation” of faculty of color to an “overrepresentation” of white faculty when discussing advancing faculty diversity
- Understand that Santa Cruz as a community has been a site of liberal racism for many faculty of color, thus leading to their departure or disengagement; at the same time, create safe spaces that help to shield marginalized faculty from further trauma while increasing pride in our connections here
- The importance of sharing physical space with one another as a means of working toward and articulating a common mission
- Recognizing the key role of staff in shaping the experiences of faculty members and students (“staff set climate”), and therefore the need to invite staff members into the DEI process
- Thinking about developing nuanced DEI training that emphasizes solidarities while recognizing potential intergroup challenges, such as the existence of colorism, casteism, bias on socioeconomic lines or based on academic pedigree, privileges of U.S. citizenship or legal residence, etc.

Indigenous Faculty Network

Our conversation on March 9 provided greater context on the ways in which IFN members take on a disproportionate load in terms of supporting faculty searches (recently one in CRES) but feel a calling to serve when such requests are made in keeping with their motto, “Nothing about us without us.” Beyond compensation for IFN members (not just the chair), additional resources, such as Advancing Faculty Diversity funding, would help to increase attention to these acts of invisible labor.

Additionally, the need to strengthen ties between UC Santa Cruz and AMTB was discussed. One of the challenges in doing so is “UCSC Fatigue” – whereby AMTB leadership is constantly called upon to support the university, but without the university making such requests through formal structures such as a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Other requests included additional course releases and summer

salaries for IFN members; a staff member to assist with administering the major and minor; a Center for Indigenous Studies on campus; more support for Indigenous students (including full scholarships for members of AMTB accepted to UC Santa Cruz); more funding for AIRC and the Amah Mutsun Relearning Garden; and resources to hire additional Native American/Indigenous Presidential Postdocs into the faculty.

A further request had to do with hiring a permanent role in the Chancellor's office to serve as a liaison with Native American/Indigenous community and campus members, but only with the support of faculty and staff from within the community. Such recruitments could follow the lead of other institutions, such as the University of Wisconsin–Madison, which conducted open recruitments for professional staff (a process that Professor Lonetree consulted on), or rely on tapping an IFN member to serve in this role for a specific period of time. The groundwork for developing such a position could take place over six months and lead to the hiring of a permanent role by the subsequent fall.

Group A (Charges 5 and 7)

Group A's primary set of recommendations is to (i) coordinate and improve fair hiring training across campus for faculty, staff, and students, and (ii) coordinate and improve review practices for faculty and staff reviews.

CHARGE 5 GOAL: Improve hiring practices for faculty, staff, and students to be more aligned with research-based best practices for inclusion and fairness
--

For faculty hiring, there are many research-based approaches for improving inclusive hiring, and a top priority is improved training for search committees and department faculty in discussing, trying out, and implementing these methods. UC Santa Cruz's current processes for faculty hiring already center contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The Faculty Equity Advocates are working on the next generation of fair hiring training materials and should be supported in that effort.

For staff hiring, the campus [Fair Hiring Guide](#) provides information and resources, and there is an [online training module](#) and a systemwide [Implicit Bias Series](#); however, these are not required. Search committees would benefit from additional support and a requirement to complete the training module and Bias series every two years. This workgroup recommends that the campus explore creation of a Staff Equity Advocate program (akin to the Faculty Equity Advocate program).

Another recommendation from this workgroup would benefit both faculty and staff hiring to align with research-based best practices: dedicating central funds for campuswide prepaid advertising specifically aimed at creating a pool of applicants that reflects the diversity of the applicants' fields. All jobs would automatically be posted to predefined venues with the purposes of enhancing strategies to increase diversity equitably across campus, thereby increasing applicant pool diversity and aligning with our Affirmative Action Plan. That automatic participation would benefit those departments with little or no advertising budget, and would reduce the overall cost of advertising to the campus as a whole. In addition, the automation of this process would result in administrative efficiencies in both APO and SHR.

Because the student hiring process is extremely decentralized, it is difficult to influence the process. Training materials and guidelines might be better distributed, and additional resources may be required for outreach and distribution. In particular, faculty may need more support and training to learn best practices for hiring students. Successful hires can depend on helping the students develop a sense of belonging. The [Career Success Supervision Toolkit](#) provides resources for mentoring student employees. It may be helpful to explore creation of a staff position to work with faculty and staff during the hiring process to improve inclusive and fair practices for student recruitment and hiring.

CHARGE 7 GOAL: Improve review/appraisal practices for faculty and staff to be more equitable, transparent, and consistent across time and settings, and, in particular, to improve how contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) are documented, assessed, and recognized

For faculty reviews, some areas for exploration are:

- How teaching is documented, assessed, and recognized (perhaps using department developed rubrics or revising rubric available from CITL);
- Documenting, including, and assessing DEI contributions in teaching, service, or research;
- Expanding definitions of research productivity to include community-engaged, digital, or public scholarship, and practitioner-oriented publications;
- Addressing whether contributions to diversity are a separate 4th category or are integrated into assessment of each of the current three categories (research, teaching, and service); and

- Addressing how the different categories (whether they are 3 or 4) are weighted.

For staff reviews, campus guidance needs to be developed on the inclusion of contributions to DEI. Training needs to be developed to help supervisors learn to include and effectively evaluate these contributions.

Transparency, expert mentoring, and staff support before, during, and after in the review/appraisal process is important for building a long-lasting culture that values inclusion, fairness, diversity, and equity.

Group B (Charges 4 and 6)

CHARGE 4 GOAL: Identify the curriculum and roadmap for the campus under the stewardship of the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.
--

Findings:

UCSC's current DEI professional development resources are growing but very scattered and primarily optional in nature outside of the hiring context. Campus should consider using a comprehensive metric to better track and assess DEI progress over time. Identifying appropriate metrics for each of the different campus populations should be informed by their respective policies and DEI best practices and documented with clear and transparent goals. Group B recommends that we view accountability from a lens of affirmation of models of behaviors, programs, and structures that should be emulated.

Recommendations:

- Provide clear goals and metrics that help us assess progress as well as obstacles. Maintain transparency for outcomes, allowing metrics to be easily accessible.
- Develop a Principles of Community required/expected learning opportunity segmented to all campus populations. The purpose of this training would be to promote inclusiveness and respect in the work and learning environments at UC Santa Cruz. Participants will become familiar with ways to integrate the UC Santa Cruz principles of community into their own workplace and classrooms. UC Davis has already established a 90 minute e-learning course which could serve as a model for the Santa Cruz course.

- Accountability must be defined so that it can be recognized, rewarded, and emulated. Some examples of rewards can be grant funding for folks who include equity analysis in their proposals, Staff/Faculty of the Year Awards (with stipends), funding and time to cover developmental opportunity participation, flexibility (including staff time) to participate in affinity group opportunities, and public recognition in Tuesday Newsday to further emphasize the culture we are building through their work.
- Professional development in the DEI space should take account of individuals' respective work environments and the nature of their roles. Managers and supervisors should encourage relevant DEI professional development amongst their teams and prioritize improving the overall climate in their units. There should be opportunities for all staff and students to engage in DEI learning opportunities during their working hours. Supervisors should encourage pauses in their day to day tasks for individuals to engage in training and affinity programs. Thus, accountability also means addressing when community members do not meet our Principles of Community and/or fail to allow direct reports to take advantage of opportunities for DEI-related professional development without documented business justifications.
- All levels need to be on the same page about what they would like to see developed for and within their offices. APO, ODEI, EEP, Ombuds, SHR and other units can provide consistent opportunities for learning towards the shared goal of equity.
- What does opportunity and accountability look like for our respective populations? How do we incentivize equity education? How does this feed into someone's tenure application, performance evaluation, and/or course credit towards the major? Our campus needs to wrestle more directly with these questions through meaningful and ongoing dialogues across many spaces. We measure what matters and without clear indicators, how we will recognize success or progress as it happens?
- Align and inform our campus efforts with the recommendations and resources of the 2023 UC CORO Systemwide Leadership Collaborative report and recommendations Advancing Inclusive Excellence Practice Among UC Leaders. The report, co-sponsored by the UCOP Vice President for Systemwide HR provides a compelling business case and action plans to improve diversity, growth mindset and address anti-racism. We are encouraged by their identification of assessment tools to improve leadership accountability to

advance diversity and inclusion. These recommendations are in alignment with President Drake's vision for a UC system that is diverse, equitable and inclusive.

CHARGE 4 GOAL: Improve coordination, transparency, clarity and alignment of DEI expectations and opportunities

Findings:

The committee identified and documented a variety of DEI learning opportunities available to students, faculty and staff. Our review illuminated that while current DEI resources are growing, there is no curation, no sustainability through funding or resources, nor is there alignment of resources in a way that allows for clear metrics and accountability. We engaged in a lot of discussion about the merits of implementing mandatory vs. voluntary campuswide training.

In our survey of non-compliance DEI related training and resources available to the UCSC community, we found that students are the only group with mandatory DEI training. We Are Slugs! is an online asynchronous training for incoming students. There is no required training for all staff, though hiring search committee members are required to complete the online Managing Implicit Bias series, and the same is required of faculty members serving on search committees. Additional training opportunities for both undergraduate and graduate students are available from F.R.E.D. (Facilitators for Race and Ethnic Diversity), which is currently funded and sustained through the African American Resource and Cultural Center by annual funding requests to the Student Fee Advisory Committee Call for Funding Proposals and LinkedIn Learning, a third party contract set to expire in 2023.

We landed on the idea that our challenge is to create a voluntary appetite and expectation for all individuals to make progress on their professional and personal development in the area of inclusion, equity, diversity and belonging. With the caveat that the university provides an overwhelming opportunity to engage in the learning, funding for departments, experts, individuals to share their expertise with the larger campus community, and access to all staff and faculty to engage in this learning during working hours without penalty, guilt, or retaliation.

We also pondered what gets in the way of advancing the individual and collective commitment to creating and sustaining a truly thriving and inclusive campus community. Honoring the diversity and racial battle fatigue² within our community requires us to recognize that people are at very different places on their DEI journey. A one-size-fits all

² <https://aacte.org/2020/09/overcoming-racial-battle-fatigue-through-education-reform/>

approach won't work if we seek to transform our community and institution. As we engage our faculty and staff experts in assisting with creating and implementing DEI learning opportunities through programs like DICEP we should be mindful of racial battle fatigue that comes with education reform and engaging with colleagues around these sensitive topics.

Recommendations:

- Feedback indicates that one-off workshops are not viable solutions. Regarding We Are Slugs!, we learned that many students clicked through online assessments in order to complete them but did not seem to gain awareness. Without ongoing learning opportunities, unless the student self-selected, the little learning or awareness that a student may have gained, was quickly forgotten. Many students we spoke with didn't remember participating in the program at all. We support incorporating DEI learning into the Core Course for incoming first-year students and onboarding training for graduate student employees, similar to what CITL offers for new incoming faculty for foundational learning on the expectations that this is a campus community that prioritizes DEI principles.
- As opposed to providing static training opportunities that cover topics like microaggressions, unlearning anti-Blackness, or sexuality and gender expression, foundational expectations around opposing traits of white supremacy³ should be provided for all university participants.
- Models of equity learning can be offered at various levels. Many members of domestic marginalized groups have different responses to introductory-level DEI training than those with only a base level of understanding. Faculty and scholars who were socialized or educated outside the United States may need additional DEI offerings that take international context into consideration. Nor can we assume intersectional understanding exists across marginalized populations.
- Every campus community participant should participate in an equity assessment to evaluate their level of knowledge. Plus, opportunities for learning should be offered in a scaffolded manner for all levels of learners and on a continuous basis for ongoing development. The assessment will identify what further development opportunities would benefit the individual and place them in a cohort of similar learners to provide an inclusive learning for everyone present rather than depending on the knowledge and trauma of BIPOC participants present who may

³ https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/preserve/museums/files/White_Supremacy_Culture.pdf

be beyond the level presented in the session simply due to their life experiences in a systemically racist and oppressive nation.

- Feedback indicates that ODEI's Diversity and Inclusion Certificate Program (DICP) takes too long – usually two years – and that its courses lump participants of varying professional, academic, and personal experience into a single introductory-level course. DICP (or subsequent programs in ODEI) should open opportunities to faculty and staff with expertise to teach 100, 200, and 300 level courses that faculty, staff, and students can engage in, and instructors should receive compensation for doing so.
- Campus should offer sustained funding for internal and external programs such as F.R.E.D., Academic Impressions, LinkedIn Learning and others. Such opportunities should not depend solely on unit budgets but be more equitably available to all employees. If campus stakeholders are being asked to provide expertise outside of their job functions, moreover, they should be compensated for that expertise. There is a tradition of not providing additional compensation for work in intersectional spaces, including translation services and advancement of DEI efforts. We recommend a model that values and compensates this additional cumbersome workload as we would for other traditional justifications for stipends and equities. Even with appropriate financial compensation, there is an emotional and physical cost of the work that must be replenished if it is to be sustained.

CHARGE 6 GOAL: Integrate roadmap in order to embed DEI into the culture.

Findings:

As noted in our above goals, it is vital to embed principles of DEI into all aspects of UCSC's culture, not only because of the daily impacts of microaggressions and other impacts of bias on large swaths of our community but because improving campus climate should be a responsibility borne by all. Recognizing a sustainable commitment to inclusion, diversity, equity and accountability requires acknowledgment that we are all on a journey and starting from different places.

In order to support our students, faculty, and staff, we must be proactive in regards to antiracist practices. Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging education should continuously change with the campus landscape/population. We should constantly be assessing the needs of the university population through ongoing assessments of the campus climate. Examples of assessments can include, but are not limited to campus

climate studies, university wide exit interviews, performance evaluations, and/or external reviews.

Recommendations:

- A commitment to personal and professional growth through DEI learning opportunities should be an expectation of every community member: faculty, staff, students, leadership and volunteers. Imbed these expectations into all levels of the employee cycle, including recruitment, onboarding, goal setting, and performance evaluation.
- Adopting a frame-work of cultural humility – an approach to sociocultural differences that is “self-first” – emphasizes intersectionality and understanding one’s own implicit biases. This approach cultivates self-awareness and self-reflection, bringing a respectful willingness to learn to interpersonal interactions.
- Consider DEI-related trainings and other learning experiences delivered in cohort or community form to provide a shared community expectation about how these goals will apply going forward.
- DEI contributions should feed into everyday work. Creating space for ongoing dialogue and conversations that consider the larger issues about what those contributions look like respective to different roles and whether they should be developed and assessed at a unit, divisional, or campuswide level. For instance, does developing a department-level diversity statement help to advance equity as an end goal? Should managers and supervisors emphasize the importance of individual responsibility in becoming more anti-racist, or is there more that can be done on a collective level? If we wish to develop a campus where all of us are social change agents, what types of commitments would that entail?

Group C (Charges 2 and 3)

CHARGE 2 GOAL: Develop a pilot DEI inventory tool for use by select staff, faculty, and students and work with CAAD, SAB, SUA, GSA, and other units to launch it in future years.

Findings: As part of its charge, Group C explored utilizing prior methods and developing new ones to inventory the emerging campus DEI inventory and take stock of efforts taking place outside of central administrative offices. During our planning meetings, it

emerged that CAAD had developed a DEI inventory in 2020 that offered an initial inventory of DEI resources, including but not limited to student and faculty pipeline programs, student and employee affinity group spaces, K-12 and community outreach, improvements in teaching and learning, undergraduate and graduate scholarships, experiential learning opportunities, and curricular innovations.

Recommendations: The group initially devised recommendations for updating and improving the CAAD document to assist the Vice Chancellor for DEI with the completion of the UCoP EDI Framework. Upon further discussion, it was recommended that UC Santa Cruz develop a tool for gathering and assessing information about DEI efforts in academic and nonacademic units alike. The group recommends developing a pilot survey tool for use in select units, then eventually launching a campuswide tool with the assistance of CAAD, SAB, GSA, and SUA. Given the sheer volume of work that has been conducted but not always shared out widely, it seems clear that we need to develop more concerted coordination among ODEI, IRAPS, and other entities on campus seeking to do data gathering, analysis, and communication in the DEI space.

CHARGE 3 GOAL: Increase data gathering and analytic capacity in ODEI to ensure close collaboration with IRAPS and academic, staff, and student units moving forward in developing and assessing DEI work.

Findings: Stakeholder conversations with the VC and AVC of DEI revealed ODEI's limitations in collaborating with units across campus on matters related to data analysis. For instance, ODEI has not been able to assess its Diversity and Inclusion Certificate Program (DICP) because it lacks adequate survey data from current participants and recent alums. IRAPS does not coordinate dedicated climate surveys, although many of its instruments have questions related to climate. There is also not currently a staff engagement or climate survey that is pending this year.

Recommendations: To expand collaboration across campus in the DEI research and planning space, Group C supports building data gathering and analytical capacity in ODEI. Once launched, ODEI's data team could provide critical assistance for use in federal grant applications and in the UCoP Advancing Faculty Diversity competition. Moreover, ODEI and IRAPS can work together to develop more finely tuned climate instruments that are relevant to subsections of the university community, whether in specific departments or divisions or measured more widely, such as "Women in STEM."

CHARGE 3 GOAL: Strengthen efforts to build community by addressing existing gaps in services.

Findings: Group C saw the potential for doing more intentional DEI strategic planning during our meeting with most of the directors of the Resource Centers (RCs). The Resource Centers serve undergraduate and graduate students and are housed under the Division of Student Affairs and Success. The Directors identified several areas of concern they have observed:

- Need to bridge the gap between academic and student affairs.
- Basic needs/housing/affordability/food insecurity for students (and employees) is a consistent theme that impacts retention and success.
- Importance of recognizing the challenges and also lifting up resilience/liberation.
- Consistent and sustained support for graduate students is necessary. Through temporary funding, RCs offer graduate student employment, and they organize programs for culturally relevant professional development, community building, and wellness.
- The need to embed and uphold UCSC's [Principles of Community](#) with greater intentionality.

We also had an illuminating conversation about the limits of the Resource Center model to increase student wellbeing and belonging, particularly when students hold multiple intersectional identities, are members of significantly under-resourced RCs (for instance, El Centro has two professional staff members serving UCSC's entire Chicana Latinx undergraduate population), and/or have lived experiences that reflect affinities not currently represented in the RC model. Additionally, RCs support undergraduates; there are no equivalent resources for graduate students, and the affinity group for Latinx and Chicana staff is no longer functioning. Thus, while our group strongly supports providing more resources (including staff support) to the RCs, we also feel that it is important to consider equity gaps ("gap analysis") in our existing DEI resources, an effort that will be made easier through a full-scale DEI inventory and assessment process.

Recommendations: Our findings suggest that centering joy is essential to the success of marginalized groups, both through structured activities and events as well as coming together in community. This does not happen in a vacuum. Holding events to celebrate our campus's diversity is a priority supported by our survey data, but so, too, is the importance of providing affinity group spaces for populations currently without access to them. Very little attention has been paid to date on the needs of international students,

staff, and faculty; Group C was unsuccessful in inviting international graduate students to an ITCC stakeholder session. Retention of graduate students must receive the same attention as for undergraduates. Our stakeholder session with a doctoral student in physics revealed some of the ways in which graduate students are socially isolated in the Santa Cruz region, thus potentially harming retention rates. We should consider developing permanently funded positions for graduate student coordinators and retention specialists.

CHARGE 2 GOAL: Build DEI inventorying and assessment into the DEI strategic planning process.

Findings: The current strategic planning process was in the planning stages before the Inaugural Vice Chancellor of DEI position was filled. Throughout this year, it became apparent that ITCC would be unable to meet with many key stakeholders whose voices are needed in the strategic planning process. A future strategic plan may benefit a large swath of our community partners who work closely with us in supporting our marginalized students, staff, faculty members, and alums.

Recommendations: A standalone campuswide DEI strategic plan would build upon Leading the Change's recommendations while tackling areas that remain challenging for our campus. We must take additional steps to document ongoing and future DEI needs and track existing and projected resources to limit equity gaps for this generation of students, staff, and faculty as well as the next. Doing so will help to foster collaborations among DEI initiatives and formalize relationships and structures.

Group D (Charge 1 and Additional Charges)

(NOTE: Since Group D's charge was the most wide-ranging, it was able to develop findings and recommendations that went well beyond Charge 1 and touched on a number of the other ITCC charges.)

CHARGE 5 GOAL: Increase the recruitment and retention of underrepresented faculty and staff, including faculty of color, women, disabled and LGBTQ+ individuals to represent the demographics of the state as is the stated goal of UCSC administration by 2030.

Findings:

The ITCC committee is composed of many of our very own stakeholders, particularly members of our faculty. Immediately, discussions in the group reflected both the

silenced suffering and long-term struggles reported by many faculty of color regarding campus climate. Indeed, several key findings emerged as described by the faculty of color we consulted:

- Microaggressions or other instances of bias against faculty of color, nonbinary faculty, and/or trans faculty by students and colleagues
- Curricular challenges, e.g., the need to decolonize the curriculum to reflect global knowledges, traditions and methodologies
- Need for greater clarity in assessing DEI work for promotions and advancements
- General climate issues including feelings and experiences of exclusion and marginalization, which may lead to faculty disengagement or early departure from the institution
- Concerns about how administrative priorities and procedures may contribute to cultures of institutional racism
- Lack of institutional reckoning with recent hurtful incidents that disproportionately impact faculty of color
- Sense that existing DEI metrics are performative and thus able to be utilized for personal advancement by those who are less invested in changing the culture
- Disparities in the Faculty Salary Equity process

Recommendations: UCSC must recognize the cultural and racial identity tax imposed on faculty. Some of the ways it can do this are to examine salary equity issues affecting marginalized faculty disproportionately; consider the ways DEI is prioritized in faculty recruitment, retention and promotion; and evaluate DEI training across all ranks, including emphasis on our Community Principles and shared mission.

CHARGE 1 GOAL: Center inclusivity in building relations with marginalized communities (“nothing about us without us”).

Findings: Our findings revealed that on particular matters related to inclusivity for marginalized communities, UCSC needs to connect to established practice – including through consulting our own staff, faculty, and other experts. As the March 9 ITCC Co-Chairs meeting with IFN and other key stakeholders revealed, our campus has not

been sufficiently proactive or inclusive in strengthening ties with the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band (AMTB) and other Native American/Indigenous communities. Similarly, Group D's discussion with the Community Faculty Network chair on Disabilities and Chronic Illnesses revealed the extent to which UCSC may be out of compliance with, and certainly less than inclusive to, our faculty, staff, students, and community members with visible and invisible disabilities. While we were unable to incorporate a lot of the specific recommendations that emerged from the latter discussion due to time constraints, a larger process of inviting feedback on UCSC's accessibility issues needs to be part of future DEI strategic planning processes. Moreover, our framework needs to shift from one of "accommodating" disability and chronic illness to one that incorporates access into every aspect of the university experience.

Recommendations: Whenever possible, adhere to the credo, "Nothing about us without us." For instance, the university should consider creating a runway (at least six months in duration) for hiring a permanent role centered on expanding UCSC's ties with the local and regional Native American/Indigenous community. During that time, it could invite staff, faculty, students, alums, and community members who identify as Native American/Indigenous and/or who have specialized subject matter expertise to provide feedback on what type of role is needed and why. Similarly, through such an inclusive process, the need to define and expand accessibility must be a central part of the standalone DEI strategic plan.

<p>CHARGE 6 GOAL: Ensure that the processes for reporting incidents, investigating complaints, and addressing incidents of discrimination and harassment are addressed with adequate resources for these offices so they are timely and comprehensive.</p>

Findings: The Chancellor's empowerment of the Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (ODEI) with the hiring of our first Vice Chancellor of DEI, as well as the new Associate Vice Chancellor of Equity and Equal Protection and new University Ombudsperson, elevates the importance of these needed units and prioritizes belonging on campus. Additionally, the Academic Personnel Office; Hate/Bias Response Team; and Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) of the Office of Risk and Safety Services propose recommendations to address real and perceived institutional, programmatic, and other equity-related gaps as well as cultures of exclusion.

Recommendations: These offices should be fully staffed. We know that delays occur due to understaffing of these offices such as ODEI, EEP and the Ombuds. For example, it is difficult to get appointments due to demands on the schedules of these offices. Additionally, we should consider connecting our Principles of Community to campus policies to go beyond compliance when developing strategies to improve our climate.

CHARGE 6 GOAL: Share the overall picture of campus climate without breaking the required confidentiality within these offices and commit to improving these processes based on the reports.

Findings: As members of our community, we must be able to trust in our protocols, processes and systems for addressing any issues of discrimination, harassment, assault or campus climate but the delay and the mystery that enshrouds the results of any complaints or any cases due to important and necessary issues of confidentiality prevents larger understanding of the effectiveness of the offices or the history and present status of our campus culture and climate. At one of our stakeholder meetings, former UCLA VC of DEI Jerry Kang spoke about the way he was able to share results, trends and findings without breaking confidentiality. In doing so, trust in our systems is enabled in our community's learning that problems are being addressed, solutions enacted and trends identified in order to improve our processes and protocols. One theme is how behaviors that do not rise to policy violations should nonetheless be tracked in how they contribute to a hostile working environment including how there are frequent occurrences by the same person. The need for Counseling and Psychological Services to support those who engage with the reporting process is also important to recognize so that they may be well-resourced in the efforts to address DEI issues on campus. Similar to the confidentiality that governs other offices, APO and its system of the documented discussions and letters of warnings, it is very hard to explain to the communities affected by complaints and grievances that disciplinary and other investigatory actions have taken place.

Recommendations: We recommend regular reporting of the work of all these offices so that our campus community knows the problems are being addressed expertly. Currently, the assessment regarding our campus conflict management is that we have a "culture of avoidance," which may be due to the lack of information these offices are able to provide. Moreover, any bungling of information or procedure should be acknowledged to encourage a culture of trust in our systems. It is important for administrative decisions to be conveyed as transparently as possible, with maximum opportunity to gather community input. This step has the additional value of building trust in institutional decision making.

The Office of Risk and Safety also is critical to the process of campus climate in that their Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) is called upon to address issues of potential violence and danger between people and in our spaces. The movement to abolish police on campus is concerned with issues of mental health versus policing, and the plight of people of color, gender non-conforming and other minorities who feel unsafe

with police and the historical record of police brutality in their engagement with these communities. Nonetheless, threatening issues and incidents prevail that campus must address in ways that acknowledge these inequities within our own communities. One way we are addressing this is to identify the issues and create conversations about them with the campus Arts project on policing that amplifies stories and experiences of policing by members of our campus community in the form of an outdoor series of exhibits such as murals, sound and video installations as well as performances on campus, both indoors and out. This project is one of several recommendations by Campus Safety Community Advisory Board (CAB) that the Chancellor accepted.

These conclusions draw on some of Group D's conversations with internal and external stakeholders. For instance, from Jerry Kang, the group learned that it was possible to create Cabinet positions for immigration and indigeneity. At UCLA, the Title IX office aspired to principles of transparency. Kang's office also had approvals for new faculty FTE, which enabled advancing faculty diversity to be a priority supported by his office.

CHARGE 5 GOAL: Create comprehensive mentorship programs to support the retention of underrepresented faculty and staff.
--

Group D considered a number of current or recent past initiatives related to retention of underrepresented faculty and staff:

Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD)

Findings: Through the Advancing Faculty Diversity program from the Office of the President, established 8 years ago, the UC Santa Cruz Community Faculty Networks and the Faculty Equity Advocates were established to help us with our recruitment and retention efforts. They are now supported by the central administration of UCSC to ensure their sustainability.

Recommendations: The UCoP Advancing Faculty Diversity Office has a collection of grant recipients addressing issues of inclusion and articles that inventory the impact of Proposition 209 in efforts towards the diversification of the professoriate since 1996. These databases, documenting almost a decade on recruitment and retention in the case of AFD and over two decades of diversification in the UCOP website, offer great models from which we can learn and advance new systems. AFD funding increasingly insists on campus support to sustain critical efforts such as the Community Faculty Networks and the Faculty Equity Advocates and the Arts Division's grant that ties Advancing Faculty Diversity to Decolonizing the Curriculum.

Community Faculty Networking Groups

Findings: In Winter Quarter 2019, UCSC created Faculty Networking Groups, commonly called “affinity groups.” These groups are still going strong and have been extended for two more years. They are open to all faculty members and focus on issues that are important to underrepresented minoritized faculty, such as Asian American/ Pacific Islander, African American, Latinx, Native American/ Indigenous, Mothers, Women in STEM, and recently, faculty with disabilities and chronic illnesses. The groups meet monthly for lunch (or online) without a set agenda and sometimes bring in speakers. Even so, many projects have come out of these meetings, such as uncovering important issues for minoritized faculty, initiating new research projects with faculty from different disciplines, developing new teaching ideas, and engaging in new service activities. The groups have helped create a sense of community; some new faculty have even said that their existence was one reason they chose to work at UC Santa Cruz over other universities. Group D’s meetings with the Community Faculty Networks revealed how their work has evolved from recruitment and retention to advocacy, where they are consulted on actions in response to various crises and asked to take part in critical departmental, divisional, and central administration conversations. While such efforts are laudable and help to improve climate for all affinity group members, one course release for the Chair may not adequately compensate for the demands imposed upon them.

Recommendations: Faculty/staff affinity organizations who engage in extensive service work on behalf of campus need to be compensated beyond the current course release for the chair, which is inadequate for their collective labor. Group D recommends either additional course releases or research funds to compensate for the additional labor of the chairs and members together or for the central administration to create professional lines for what is a clear need.

Faculty Equity Advocates

Findings: FEAs are crucial in promoting equity and fostering an inclusive campus environment. They provide training and guidance to departmental leaders, share best practices, and offer workshops to create inclusive spaces. They also educate faculty on fair hiring practices and assist in unbiased decision-making during recruitment processes, ensuring diverse candidate pools and equitable selection processes. As the program moves forward, the role of FEAs in promoting DEI efforts for faculty recruitment and retention is expected to expand. This expansion will include analyzing hiring, tenure, promotion, and exit rates within departments to identify trends, disparities, and areas for improvement. FEAs may participate in exit interviews to better understand the

reasons behind faculty separations and identify potential equity concerns. They will also help to establish a formal and informal mentoring structure, particularly for faculty from underrepresented groups, by supporting their professional growth and retention.

Recommendations: To empower FEAs, it is essential to provide them with the resources, authority, and institutional support needed to effect change. This support includes access to relevant data, professional development opportunities, and a platform to communicate their findings and recommendations. A commitment from leadership to prioritize equity concerns will help create an “ecosystem” where equity is central to all aspects of academic life. Establishing a well-defined scope of work for FEAs is important to prevent them from becoming overwhelmed. Regular assessments and adjustments will ensure that they continue addressing pressing equity concerns as their role evolves. The program must be sustained by central funding.

CHARGE 1 GOAL: Support community-building events such as public fora, town halls and leadership councils that bring our university leadership, faculty, staff and students together.

Findings: Various divisions organize student fora, whether in leadership councils or town halls, in the departments and divisions. Moreover, the collegiate system on which the campus was founded offered great extracurricular opportunities in the early years of our campus. It might be time to re-imagine how to foster the capacity for public debate.

Recommendations: UCSC should strive to strengthen connections among student groups, staff support and faculty networks as a priority for community building on campus. It might revive student debate forums on campus as a method to provide undergraduates with a learning opportunity on respectfully engaging in public domains, including local governments, state bodies, and elsewhere.

CHARGE 1 GOAL: Support pipeline projects that connect the university with regional and local communities.

Findings: Group members identified several external community groups with which our campus members are already collaborating with in the DEI space. They include:

The **Humanities Division** focuses on public-engaged and community scholarship such as its recent community event at the Museum of Art and History (MAH) that celebrated Japanese American history, heritage, culture and politics to the region in collaboration with local and national community organizations. Watsonville Is In the Heart (WIITH), a collaboration between the Humanities and the Arts, also collaborates with regional and

local communities and organizations to address the history of Filipinx peoples in the region. It was recently awarded a prestigious National Endowment for the Humanities grant.

The **Arts Division** prioritizes the strengthening of pipelines that demonstrate accountability to the region and the communities our faculty, staff and students bring to campus. Programs include:

- For 32 years, the African American Theater Arts Troupe has brought its productions to the African American coastal community of Seaside; this year, the division brought 400 high school student leaders for the Black Students of California United conference to meet with student organizations, faculty and staff with the highlight of Distinguished Professor Emerita Angela Y. Davis.
- One longtime offering is the Arts Bridge program that brings our diverse students in paid teaching roles in the arts to diverse local and regional communities.
- The Art Department is also working with the Sesnon Galleries and the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band in their programming this quarter.
- The Environmental Art and Social Practice (EASP) is also requiring all their grad MFA students to collaborate with regional communities and those whom they bring globally.
- The Institute of Arts and Sciences galleries opened our first climate-controlled museum space that bridges community and university with its opening exhibitions focused on prison abolition and indigenous art and media that brings prominent visiting artists to the community.
- Recent regional collaborations include the Watsonville Film Festival, which focused on Latinx communities with significant participation from alumni and current students.

In the **Social Sciences Division**, a faculty member in Environmental Studies has served as an expert member on the California State Board of Education state text book review committee and is currently collaborating with teachers in the Santa Clara school district in teaching environmental justice. College Provost and Environmental Studies faculty member Flora Lu also co-teaches a DICP course on “Intersections between Diversity and the Environment” that has received strong interest in the UCSC community.

Recommendations: Strengthen the regional pipelines from the university to community broadly defined, in the form of permanent budget line items for this work across all units on campus. Ideas include:

- There is a report on collaboration in a statewide report on Black reparations in the state of California. There was some discussion about taking advantage of this possibility to broaden our understanding of reparations historically as an anti-imperialist, anti-racist concept, and who makes claims for reparations and on what basis. Don Tamaki (Professor Emerita Karen Tei Yamashita’s cousin), one of the authors of the “Task Force to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African Americans, with a Special Consideration for African Americans Who are Descendants of Persons Enslaved in the United States,” will be coming to speak on campus in Spring 2023.
- Amplify efforts to celebrate the efforts and achievements for which our campus and region should be known. Identify local and regional histories that need to be archived and historicized in the self-understanding and self-presentation of the campus, such as building awareness that Santa Cruz was a transit location to the Bay Area and Oakland during the Great Migration; exploring the influence of *The Black Liberation Front* on and off campus in the late 1960s; and investigating legacies of racism and xenophobia.
- Archive and record the historical context of our region and to support the leaders and communities representing them. It is critical to account for the histories of our region regarding race and inequality. Anti-Blackness in our area and region needs to be accounted for. For the Filipinx community, for whom this region is particularly significant, acknowledging the legacy of histories of racism here in the region is critical and the roles of local efforts matter in this way such as Gabriela Santa Cruz and Anak Bayan.

CHARGE 2 GOAL: Bolster ODEI and divisional DEI roles and offices, growing their capacity to collaborate with campus partners and serve as a nexus for campuswide and divisional DEI efforts, respectively.

Findings: The Ombuds office was re-established in January 2023 after being defunct for many years. That office, now staffed by a single employee, will need to time to ramp up, especially since the Office of Conflict Resolution will no longer be in operation. Additionally, EEP has had a number of staffing issues, which has led to the assumption of duties by interim leads. ODEI has five employees including the Vice Chancellor and

will be down to four employees as of May 1. Staffing therefore remains a serious concern for our university's legal obligations regarding compliance as well as for ensuring a healthy and inclusive climate that goes beyond compliance. (ITCC was unable to speak with the Ombudsperson given time constraints.)

Recommendations: Build on earlier goals to strengthen DEI efforts in offices reporting directly to the Chancellor (ODEI/EEP/Ombuds) as well as those offices reporting to divisional deans. Provide additional support as needed to units working to reduce equity gaps and meet compliance (e.g., APO, Hate/Bias Response Team, BIT). Group D recommends the following:

- Ensure fully staffed and well-compensated DEI offices so as to reduce the difficulty of accessing these services. In particular, strengthen support of DEI in divisional budgets and in ODEI and bolster resources for Counseling and Psychological Services in relation to DEI.
- Develop more funding for creative solutions that can increase collaboration and address areas of unmet need.
- Document the entire ecosystem of DEI activities on ODEI's website. This will serve as a way for all community members to contact organizers or stakeholders based on a number of search parameters. The ODEI website can offer information about central, divisional and departmental activities and initiatives; faculty and staff affinity groups; DEI associate deans; FEAs; outreach programs to K-12, undergraduate, and graduate students; connections with UCOP and other UC campuses; and other key resources.

The group acknowledged several challenges to achieving these goals, including limited funding, resistance to change, and lack of awareness and support. To overcome these challenges, the group recommended leveraging existing resources and partnerships, engaging stakeholders in the process, and communicating the importance of DEI work to the campus community.

CONCLUSION

The ITCC committee has reached a number of recommendations that we believe would serve UCSC well into the coming years. As our committee members and stakeholders look ahead to the implementation stage of our campuswide strategic plan, we hope that this report serves as an important contribution to ongoing discussions about how best to support, uphold, and ensure an equitable, inclusive, accessible, and thriving campus community at UC Santa Cruz as well as help to build stronger pipelines to future Banana Slugs from surrounding regions and statewide.

Ensure Equitable Recruitment and Review

Support the development or expansion of fair hiring training and related processes for faculty, staff, and student employees in alignment with research-based best practices. Change review practices for faculty and staff to be more equitable and better account for contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion. Develop structures that more fully recognize the range of employee contributions to DEI. Establish innovative mentorship programs for underrepresented faculty and staff. To ensure DEI work is equitably shared, acknowledge the disproportionate workload of many minoritized faculty, staff, and graduate student employees and evaluate more critically how to compensate for it.

Improve Professional Development and Accountability

Invite ODEI stewardship of campuswide DEI educational resource coordination. Strengthen a comprehensive DEI training program for all faculty, staff, and students that draws upon existing campus assets. Align DEI professional development expectations and opportunities in more transparent, actionable ways. Utilize data gathering and assessment tools when weighing new or revised DEI educational offerings. Consider the merits of voluntary vs. required DEI training for different campus populations. Think through issues of accountability when developing training and assessment. Create more learning pathways, including cohort models, rather than “one size fits all” approaches. Offer more short-term and asynchronous opportunities. Center the lived experiences of marginalized faculty, staff, and students on campus rather than viewing DEI training through an aspirational or abstract lens.

Better DEI Data Collection, Assessment, and Dissemination

Ensure that DEI inventorying and assessment is a collaborative effort involving campuswide and divisional DEI offices and shared governance groups. Utilize a pilot approach to determine effective data gathering techniques moving forward. Work with CAAD, SAB, GSA, SUA, and others to launch a data inventory tool. Increase data

gathering and analytic capacity in ODEI to ensure close collaboration with IRAPS and academic, staff, and student units moving forward in developing and assessing DEI work. Build inventorying and assessment mechanisms into a robust DEI strategic planning process. Consider launching population-specific climate surveys for faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduates.

Improve Retention and Climate

Commit to increasing faculty diversity on a number of fronts. Increase the recruitment and retention of underrepresented faculty and staff. Provide adequate staff resources to ensure robust mechanisms to report compliance and climate issues. Maintain confidentiality while modeling transparency and accountability. Hold community members accountable for breaches of the Principles of Community while working proactively to embed DEI cultural norms. Decolonize the curriculum in ways that support our overall faculty and student recruitment and retention processes. Develop and launch a roadmap intended to embed positive aspects of campus culture.

Increase On-Campus Partnerships

Bolster ODEI and divisional DEI roles and offices individually and in coordination with one another. Use soon-to-be-launched ODEI digital assets to share information about DEI efforts in departments and divisions. Plan and launch a standalone DEI strategic plan that is coordinated with DEI leads across campus and builds on the recommendations in *Leading the Change*.

Build External Partnerships

Launch on-campus and community events to recognize important occasions for all of our community members. Focus efforts to create community-building events and strengthen affinity groups. Initiate pipeline projects to strengthen ties with local and regional communities in keeping with our campus priorities. Invite feedback in DEI strategic planning processes, particularly when reaching long-underserved constituents and when launching new roles supporting marginalized communities (“nothing about us without us”).

Ensure Stronger Cultures of Compliance

While respecting confidentiality, provide regular updates on the work of institutional units to signal expert handling of climate or compliance issues. Share findings and model transparency to pierce the opaqueness of equity work. Build trust in administrative systems and learn from past missteps in ways that improve our systems. Support community-building opportunities among faculty, staff, and students. Strengthen regional and statewide collaborations, especially in our academic divisions. Bolster support for key DEI offices on campus.

APPENDIX

Charge & Background:

- Item A1: Stakeholder Meeting Chronology (p. 51)

Recommendations

- Item A2: Group A: Exemplars for Hiring and Review (p. 55)
- Item A3: Group D: Definition of Community (p. 56)

Item A1: Stakeholder Meeting Chronology

I. Full Committee Stakeholder Meetings

- Tuesday, February 7, 2023 – Teenie Matlock, Special Advisor to the Chancellor on Indigenous Relations

- Tuesday, February 21, 2023 – Associate Deans of DEI

Attending, in alphabetical order:

1. Gina Dent, Associate Dean of DEI, Humanities
 2. Marcella Gomez, Associate Dean of DEI, Engineering
 3. Judit Moschkovich, Associate Dean of DEI, Social Sciences
 4. Christina Ravelo, Associate Dean of DEI, Physical & Biological Sciences
- Karlton Hester, Associate Dean of DEI, Arts, was invited but unable to attend.

- Tuesday, March 7, 2023 – Faculty Equity Advocates (FEAs)

Attending, in alphabetical order:

1. Needhi Bhalla, Physical & Biological Sciences
2. Alvaro Cardenas, FEA, Engineering
3. Patty Gallagher, FEA, Arts
4. Marcella Gomez, FEA, Engineering
5. Kathleen Kay, Physical & Biological Sciences
6. John Jota Leaños, FEA, Arts
7. Judit Moschkovich, FEA, Social Sciences
8. Juan Poblete, FEA, Humanities

Also invited but unable to attend were Grace Peña Delgado, FEA, Humanities, and Jean Fox Tree, FEA, Social Sciences.

- Tuesday, April 18, 2023 – Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Vice Chancellor & Chief Diversity Officer Anju Reejhsinghani and Assistant Vice Chancellor Judith Estrada

II. ITCC Co-Chair Stakeholder Meetings

- Thursday, March 9, 2023 – UCSC Indigenous Staff and Faculty Stakeholders, in collaboration with Climate Change, Sustainability and Resilience (CCSR) Committee

Attending, in alphabetical order:

1. Elida Erickson, Co-Chair of CCSR & Sustainability Director
2. Rick Flores, CCSR Member, Director of Horticulture, & Steward, Amah Mutsun Relearning Program
3. Sikina Jinnah, Co-Chair of CCSR & Professor, Environmental Studies
4. Rebecca Hernandez, McHenry Library Community Archivist
5. Amy Lonetree, Indigenous Faculty Network (IFN) Chair & Professor, History
6. Flora Lu, CCSR Member, Provost of College Nine, & Professor, Environmental Studies
7. Renya Ramirez, Former IFN Chair & Faculty, Anthropology Department
8. Anju Reejhsinghani, ITCC Co-Chair & Vice Chancellor for DEI
9. Angel Riotutar, American Indian Resource Center Director
10. Celine Parreñas Shimizu, ITCC Co-Chair & Dean of Arts
11. Asia Valdivia, ITCC Administrative Support Staff

Also invited but unable to attend were faculty members Jean Fox Tree, John Jota Leaños, and Felicity Amaya Schaeffer and Special Advisor to the Chancellor on Indigenous Relations Teenie Matlock.

III. Workgroup Stakeholder Meetings

Group A: Recruitment, Retention, and Belonging

- Friday, February 17, 2023 – Veronica Heiskell, Associate Director of Experiential Learning & Student Employment
- Tuesday, February 28, 2023 – Conra Frazier, AVC and EEO Director

Group B: Professional Development and Accountability

- Thursday, March 2, 2023 – Jody Greene, Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL) and other faculty development opportunities
- Thursday, March 9, 2023 - Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Vice Chancellor and Assistant Vice Chancellor
- Friday, April 14, 2023 – Lorato Anderson, Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Graduate Studies

Group C: DEI Inventory and Assessment

- Wednesday, March 8, 2023 – UCSC Resource Center Directors

In attendance (in alphabetical order):

1. delfin bautista, Lionel Cantú Queer Resource Center
2. Xiomara Lopez, Director, El Centro: Chicanx Latinx Resource Center
3. Angel Riotutar, American Indian Resource Center Director
4. Caz Salamanca, Asian American/Pacific Islander Resource Center

The Directors of the African American Resource and Cultural Center (Autumn Johnson) and Womxn's Center (Mai Foua Her) were invited but unable to attend.

- Wednesday, March 12, 2023 – Rebecca Ropers, UCSC American Council on Education (ACE) Fellow
- Wednesday, March 19, 2023 – Graduate Student Stakeholders (one student from the Physics Department attended)

Group D: Community, State, and System Partnerships

- Friday, February 10, 2023 – Jerry Kang, UCLA's former Inaugural Dean of DEI (event organized by the UCSC AAPI Faculty Initiative)
- Tuesday, February 28, 2023 – UC Office of the President Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) initiative
- Wednesday, March 15, 2023 – UCSC Community Faculty Network chairs

In attendance (in alphabetical order):

1. Kirsten Silva Gruesz, Latinx/Chicanx Faculty Network
2. Amy Lonetree, Chair, Indigenous Faculty Network (IFN)
3. Megan Moodie, Chair, Disabilities & Chronic Illness Faculty Network

Also invited but unable to attend were Rebecca Braslau, Women in STEM chair; Courtney Bonam, African American/Black/Caribbean chair; Lindsey Dillon, Academic Mothers chair; LS Kim, Asian American/Pacific Islander chair; and Renya Ramirez, former IFN chair.

Item A2: Group A: Exemplars for Hiring and Review

Faculty hiring:

- PBCSci “[Ensuring Fair Hiring and Valuing DEI in Searches in the Sciences-Suggested Guidelines for Discussion](#)”
 - Links to public versions of the articles in the document above:
 - [Hofstra et al \(2020\)](#). The Diversity–Innovation Paradox in Science. PNAS.
 - [Way et al \(2018\)](#). Productivity, prominence, and the effects of academic environment.
 - [Fox Tree & Vaid \(2022\)](#). Why so Few, Still? Challenges to Attracting, Advancing, and Keeping Women Faculty of Color in Academia.
 - [Covarrubias & Quinteros \(2022\)](#). Calling out Whiteness: Faculty of Color Redefining University Leadership.
- UCSC “[Best Practices for Improving Diversity in Faculty Hiring](#)”
- UC Berkeley “[Searching for a Diverse Faculty](#)”
- University of Wisconsin “[Searching for Excellence & Diversity](#)”

Staff hiring:

- UCSC [Best Practices for Improving Diversity in Staff Hiring](#)
- UC Berkeley “[Diversity Recruiting Toolkit](#)”
- Higher Ed Recruitment Consortium ([HERC](#))

Student hiring:

- UCSC “[How to Target Your Postings in Handshake](#)”

Faculty review:

- UCSC “[Recognizing Contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in Personnel Reviews at a Minority-Serving Research-Intensive University](#)”
- Worcester Polytechnic Institute “[A New Approach to Recognizing Faculty Contributions-WPI Restructures Faculty Promotion Process](#)”

Staff review:

- UCSC Academic Affairs [Guidelines for describing and assessing staff contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion](#)

Item A3: Group D: Definition of “Community”

1. Engaging with local communities: UCSC must collaborate with local government, organizations, businesses, and residents to address pressing social issues, promote cultural understanding, and foster intellectual interventions that promote economic growth. By embracing DEI values in these partnerships, UCSC can help bridge racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic divides and contribute to the overall well-being of the local community.
2. Fostering global connections: As UCSC increasingly engages with international partners and welcomes students from diverse backgrounds, DEI values help to create an inclusive environment that promotes intercultural understanding, fosters global citizenship, and prepares UCSC students for the demands of a globalized workforce.
3. Recruitment and retention: By actively recruiting and retaining individuals from diverse backgrounds, UCSC can create a more inclusive and equitable community by supporting diverse faculty, staff, and students. This includes ensuring equitable representation and opportunities for underrepresented groups, promoting culturally responsive pedagogy, and providing resources and support for DEI-related initiatives.
4. Encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration: UCSC can create a collaborative and inclusive intellectual community by fostering connections between academic disciplines and departments. This encourages diverse perspectives and promotes innovative problem-solving, ultimately contributing to academic excellence at UCSC and its societal impact.
5. Involving alumni and industry partners: UCSC can engage with alumni and industry partners to support DEI initiatives, provide mentorship and networking opportunities, and promote career development for students from diverse backgrounds. By including these stakeholders in UCSC’s broader community, our campus can further advance its DEI goals and foster a more inclusive environment.