

## **Vice Chancellor Letter to UCLA Chancellor**

To: Chancellor Albert Carnesale  
From: Claudia Mitchell-Kernan  
Subject: Evaluation of Proposal from Directors of Ethnic Studies Centers

Date: July 30, 2003

The Directors of UCLA's African American, American Indian, Asian American, and Chicano Studies Centers have proposed a Faculty Diversity Initiative (FDI), its centerpiece a request that 24 new FTEs be allocated to the Organized Research Units (ORUs) in ethnic studies. The FDI is organized around three principal goals: strengthening ethnic studies research and teaching at UCLA; increasing the diversity of UCLA's faculty; and enhancing relationships with the culturally diverse Los Angeles community.

This report responds to your request for my evaluation of the directors' proposal. In assessing its merits, I will consider how the Faculty Diversity Initiative might work to foster UCLA's and the University of California's strategic priorities, including those you have proposed. My report has been developed in two phases, the first of which assembled information provided by the Planning Office to assess the impact on teaching of a previous allocation of institutional FTEs to the ethnic studies centers. This seemed the most direct way to address the question you raised as to whether the university's teaching mission would be served by allocating FTEs to the ORU's.

The results of this examination were the basis of a preliminary report, which I shared with you on April 20, 2003. Subsequently, I circulated this report to campus leaders copied on your February letter requesting their feedback on the FDI and the preliminary report. At my request, the center directors engaged in meetings and consultations with department chairs and several deans to determine the interest of various sectors of the campus in the initiative they had proposed.

The resulting report is thus based on analysis of data provided by the Planning Office; feedback from campus leaders whose views were sought; letters from deans and department chairs conveying interest in working with the centers in faculty recruitment and hiring; supporting letters from the Faculty Advisory Committee of each center; and supporting letters from the Academic Senate leadership and the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity. Letters from a number of community leaders and organizations have also informed the views presented here.

### **Faculty Diversity as a Strategic Priority**

In their proposal for the FDI, the center directors present demographic material and other data as a basis for advocating the importance of faculty diversity to UC and UCLA. Given recent policy and program developments at UCLA and UC the strategic importance of faculty diversity seems widely recognized.

Acknowledging the need to attend to issues of multiculturalism, economic opportunity, and educational equity, then-UC President Atkinson announced a Faculty Recruitment Initiative in

January 2001, a pilot program is now in its final year. At UCLA, an Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Diversity has been appointed, with responsibility for eight FTEs from the UC initiative. UC also has initiated a Faculty Fellows Program, which aims to provide recent PhDs from UC campuses with experience, mentorship, and training in research and teaching. The ORU directors at UCLA support all these initiatives and argue that the ORUs, if allotted an additional 24 FTEs, can make a separate and important contribution to advancing the goal of faculty diversity. I will examine that assertion by reviewing what the record tells us about the impact on faculty diversity and on ethnic studies of the previous allocation of FTEs to the centers.

### **Ethnic Studies FTEs and Faculty Diversity**

In 1977, the first 16 FTEs for ethnic studies were allocated to the ethnic studies ORUs at UCLA, then still less than a decade old. As reflected in supporting letters from Faculty Advisory Committees and the subsequent evolution of ethnic studies at UCLA, this early initiative launched a trajectory that led to national and international stature for UCLA's programs in African American, American Indian, Asian American, and Chicano Studies. M. Belinda Tucker, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee for the Ralph J. Bunche Center, notes that faculty development was the lynchpin of success in UCLA's growth to national prominence in ethnic studies. Noting that resignations, retirements, and deaths have diminished the size of the faculty cohort, she sees the FDI as the key to continued success for these programs.

Besides promoting the goals of ethnic studies, the FTEs allocated to ethnic studies centers have had an impact on the departments where the faculty reside. A number of campus leaders have indicated that the availability of these now senior faculty as colleagues and mentors has been an important factor in the recruitment and retention of a more diverse and stronger faculty. Specifically, Dean of Social Sciences Scott Waugh notes that the

*. . . policy of providing ethnic studies centers with FTE to be housed in departments around the campus has been highly successful in recruiting to UCLA outstanding scholars, who have been instrumental in developing research and scholarship concerning ethnicity, ethnic communities, and contemporary society and culture in a wide range of disciplines.*

While faculty diversity was not an explicit goal of the first ethnic studies FTE allocation, increased faculty diversity was nevertheless a significant outcome of this early initiative. At the present time, 25 FTEs are included on the rosters of the four ethnic studies ORUs, 23 of which are filled; searches are under way to fill two vacancies. Demographically, this cohort of faculty is highly diverse and includes: 7 Asian and Pacific Islanders, 3 American Indians, 2 whites, 7 African Americans, and 6 Chicano/Latinos. Eleven or 48% of the 23 faculty are women, and thus these exceptional appointments led to an increase in gender diversity as well as ethnic diversity. The Centers' success in achieving gender equity in hiring is truly exemplary and far exceeds the broader campus record where a bit more than 23% of ladder faculty are women.

The yield of the first initiative in terms of faculty diversity was in part due to the fact that many young minority scholars were being attracted to the multidisciplinary fields that comprise ethnic studies and that this pool also contained greater gender balance than many disciplinary areas. This continues to be the case.

Scholars with specializations in ethnic studies have, over time, also helped to diversify the administrative ranks. Besides myself, Associate Vice Chancellors Franklin Gilliam and Rosina Becerra are evidence of this trend. In addition, 13 of the 25 faculty members on the roster of ethnic studies have held administrative appointments in the last three years as associate deans, directors, associate directors, chairs, and vice chairs.

The campus experience has been that applicant pools are more diverse when searches are launched for scholars specializing in African American Studies, Chicano Studies, Asian American Studies, or American Indian Studies. Such scholars also have complementary expertise in traditional disciplines and professional areas but might not fit neatly into the faculty vacancies typically advertised in disciplinary departments. A recent case is illustrative.

In April of this year, I was approached by a UCLA dean who had been diverted in her effort to bring to UCLA an exceptionally promising scholar of color. A Stanford PhD in social psychology, the young scholar's research embraces psychology, education, and American Indian Studies as it examines the social nature of identity, cultural variation in the self, and the influence of racial identity on school performance. She had strong endorsements from leaders in the field of social psychology, and a UCLA department was interested in hiring her. The search committee, however, did not recommend her because her interests were not the best fit for the advertised position in applied human development. Had this search been launched through the American Indian Studies ORU, it might well have led to a faculty appointment.

This case is also illustrative of barriers to the hiring of ethnic minority candidates arising from defining vacancies in terms of disciplinary and subdisciplinary specialization. These long-standing practices tend to reduce the potential pool of minority candidates and reproduce the traditional academic and demographic profile of faculty. From this vantage point, assigning FTEs to the ethnic studies centers has served to dismantle some barriers and open the gates to the flow of new people and new ideas.

The faculty hiring that resulted from the original allotment of FTEs to the ethnic studies centers has helped to infuse a broad range of UCLA academic programs with the content and methods of multicultural and interdisciplinary studies. Faculty members hired through the center-assigned FTEs now make their homes in five departments in the humanities and social sciences divisions of the College of Letters and Sciences and in nine departments of six professional schools, as seen in Table 1. The impact of this diffusion of resources will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

### **Impact on Curriculum and Teaching**

The presence of faculty hired through the ethnic studies centers has had an impact on the curriculum of fourteen departments, as indicated in Table 1.

While noting that the policy has resulted in a more diverse and stronger faculty Dean Scott Waugh highlights two additional areas of significant impact resulting from the previous allocation of ethnic studies FTEs: With respect to cross-fertilization he observes:

*... as ethnic studies FTE have been hired, units have taken deeper interest in a wide variety of issues related to race and ethnicity such that UCLA is now viewed as one of the leading centers for the study of race and ethnicity. [And]...as ethnic studies scholarship has increasingly placed the American experience in global perspective, ethnic studies research has become linked with the campus priority in international studies. ...the intellectual interests of faculty in ethnic studies are highly complementary ... with the existing interests of departments, programs, and the campus as a whole.*

*Dean Waugh also draws attention to the positive role that the ethnic studies centers have played in fostering interdisciplinarity on the UCLA campus, a direction highly consistent with your view that interdisciplinarity is one of the hallmarks of modern scholarship and one of UCLA's strengths.*

*Ethnic studies centers have been at the forefront of this trend toward bringing together scholars from all disciplines and corners of the campus. [Ethnic Studies FTEs have] .... also borne fruit in undergraduate teaching, as evidenced in the growing numbers of Asian American and Chicano Studies majors. The popularity of these programs can be attributed in part to the fact that they are composed of courses that approach the ethnic experience from a rich variety of disciplinary perspectives.*

A number of new interdepartmental degree programs (IDPs) were established or got meaningfully under way following the allocation of ethnic studies FTEs.

<u>Chicano Studies</u>	<u>Asian American Studies</u>	<u>American Indian Studies</u>	<u>African American Studies</u>
BA	BA and MA	BA and MA	BA and MA
	MA/MSW	MA/JD	MA/JD
	MA/MPH		
	MA/MA Urban Planning		

In addition, undergraduate minors in the various fields have been established with the minor in Asian American Studies reaching over 200 students. Proposals for graduate programs in Chicano Studies are in preparation and the proposal for an Asian American MA/MA Information Studies is under Senate review.

The presence of degree programs in ethnic studies has, in turn, led to further opportunities for interdepartmental and interschool collaborations in the establishment of the concurrent graduate degree programs mentioned above, in Law, Public Health, and Social Welfare and Information Studies.

### **Teaching Workload**

African American, Asian American, American Indian, and Chicano Studies faculty offer courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and constitute a resource not only for the interdepartmental teaching programs in ethnic studies but for the 14 departments where the faculty formally reside. In the three-year period from 1999 - 2002, general campus ethnic studies faculty averaged 6.06 primary and 7.34 independent courses per year.

Table 2 provides a display of a number of measures of faculty workload for the period 1999-2002. Table 3 extends this description of instructional impact by comparing the workload of ethnic studies faculty with the workload of their school and divisional peers according to several measures. [1]

Ethnic studies faculty who reside in general campus professional schools averaged 178.61 Student Credit Hours (SCH) per year comparing very favorably to the 179.36 SCH for general campus professional school faculty. This is especially noteworthy in light of the large number of administrative appointments these faculty have held during this period. For the same period, ethnic studies faculty in five departments of the College of Letters and Science generated an average of 184 SCH in comparison to the 350 SCH generated by their L & S peers. While humanities and social science faculty, generated substantially fewer SCH than their divisional peers, their workload in terms of primary and undergraduate courses taught is well within or above divisional averages. The average SCH for ethnic studies L & S faculty in the comparison years may however, be somewhat idiosyncratic, reflecting an unusual number of leaves of absence and pattern of course relief. To address this question, workload data from 2002-2003 were examined for this group of faculty (See Table 2A). For the past year, 7.34 active teaching FTE were reported and the three quarter average for the year was 329.79 SCH, much closer to the three quarter average SCH for their humanities + social science comparison group.

It also seems noteworthy that a preponderance of undergraduate courses offered by ethnic studies L & S faculty were at the upper rather than lower division level during the years examined. This very small cohort of faculty, averaging a bit more than 7 FTEs per year, is also being compared to a peer group that exceeds 500 FTEs. The somewhat higher three quarter average SCH of the latter may reflect the presence of large lower division courses in many departments.

Ethnic Studies faculty have also played an exemplary role in graduate education. They have chaired and co-chaired a large number of doctoral dissertation and masters thesis committees, serving as a critical intellectual training and mentoring system for the next generation of interdisciplinary scholars. Indeed, UCLA has produced more scholars for the field of ethnic studies than any other university in the nation during the past three decades.

Undergraduate courses taught by UCLA ladder faculty are currently the subject of campus interest, and it is relevant to examine the teaching workload of ethnic studies faculty with respect to this workload indicator. As can be seen in Table 3, compared to their peers, they teach slightly more undergraduate courses in Arts and Architecture, Social Sciences, Humanities, and the School of Public Policy and Social Research than their school and divisional peers. In the schools of Theater, Film, and Television and Education and Information Studies, they teach fewer undergraduate courses than their peers. Overall, the data suggest that in terms of SCH, primary courses, and under-graduate courses, ethnic studies faculty are well within UCLA's overall campus profile.

### **Feasibility Issues**

In assessing the merits of the FDI, I have thought it particularly important to consider feasibility/implementation issues that might arise due to a lack of interest in the collaborative recruitment that would be required by the initiative. This concern has been largely put to rest.

It is evident that over the last two decades, the College of Letters and Sciences and the professional schools have become accustomed to collaborating with the ethnic studies ORUs in the recruitment of faculty. Deans Scott Waugh (Social Sciences), Christopher Waterman (Arts and Architecture), Linda Rosenstock (Public Health), and Aimee Dorr (Education and Information Studies) have each expressed an interest in conducting searches with one or more of the centers. Dean Waugh offered an enthusiastic endorsement of the initiative, arguing that “the investment of FTE in this kind of program can yield greater returns over time.” Dean Waterman noted that a number of units in Arts and Architecture would benefit from pursuing joint faculty appointments with the ORUs and welcomes the opportunity to work together [with the directors] on the FDI. Six department chairs Virginia Walter (Information Studies), Douglas Hollan (Anthropology), Peter Nabokov (World Arts and Cultures), Mark Petersen, (Public Policy), Teofilo Ruiz (History) and Ted Benjamin (Social Welfare) have written to describe benefits their departments expect to enjoy as a result of such joint initiatives. Chairman Ruiz believes these FTE would be an important component of a planned refocusing of the History Department in new and innovative areas. Thus, from the perspective of campus receptivity to joint recruitment and hiring, no feasibility issues have been encountered. [2]

Certainly, some details of implementation will require further attention. While the directors emphasized enrollment growth as a possible source of the FTEs for the FDI, faculty turnover may hold more promise as a source of faculty provisions. If allocating twenty four FTEs at a single point in time proves difficult, the increase might be incremental, for example, 4 FTEs over each of the next six years.

I am mindful that this recommendation does not address the question of how many FTEs should be allocated to ethnic studies. It seems unlikely that this question can be answered in isolation. In establishing a feasible target, however, it should be emphasized that all of the centers and their programs would benefit significantly from additional FTEs. And, if a new allocation produces results similar to the previous one, the investment in ethnic studies would also bring benefits to a wide range of campus sectors. The scholars who would be recruited would be able to contribute to the UCLA’s disciplinary and professional programs as well as to its inter-disciplinary ethnic studies programs.

The CSRC Faculty Advisory Committee, for example, has developed its hiring priorities within a four part strategic framework: (1) adding new areas within the inter and transdisciplinary field of Chicano studies; (2) adding depth to existing areas of strength in Chicano studies at UCLA; (3) contributing to the undergraduate curriculum in ways that encourage cross departmental offerings; and (4) supporting a service and community orientation. The five highest priorities that emerged from a ranked list of 33 were World Arts and Cultures, History, Anthropology, Information Studies, and Public Health. In all cases the respective deans and department chairs have expressed strong interest in working with CSRC to recruit faculty who develop research and curricular offerings consistent with the strategic framework. The FDI reviews the hiring priorities of each of the centers and the overview of CSRC priorities included here is intended to briefly illustrate the groundwork undertaken and foundations laid to launch a faculty diversity initiative. Along with the information presented in earlier sections of this report, there is substantial evidence of campus readiness to implement the FDI on the scale proposed. 2

## Summary

There is a wealth of evidence of the benefits to the campus that have flowed from the ethnic studies ORU's over the past three decades. [3] Since they are well documented in the centers' recent fifteen-year reviews, these achievements have not been reviewed extensively in the present report. Rather, I have presented information about the returns that have been realized from the campus' first investment of FTEs in ethnic studies in 1977.

Based on the data and perspectives thus far garnered, it would appear that a variety of benefits would flow from endorsement of the FDI with the assignment of additional FTEs to the ethnic studies centers:

- An increase in the ethnic and gender diversity of UCLA faculty, with impacts across campus
- An ensuing enhancement of diversity within the administrative ranks
- Support for the ethnic studies research mission as the centers continue to build on their national and international reputations
- New curricular infusions for a wide range of academic departments
- Enrichment of curricular initiatives in areas that constitute campus strengths: interdisciplinarity, race and ethnic studies, international studies
- Intellectual diversity in research undertaken and curricular offerings
- Contributions to the university's teaching mission, through the ethnic studies IDPs, as well as school and college curricula.

In regard to the latter, I would note the special contribution that faculty in ethnic studies make as role models and mentors for students of color across campus. This contribution grows in importance as the UCLA student body comes to reflect California's increasing racial and ethnic diversity.

No significant drawbacks were uncovered in my review. Deans and department chairs across campus appear to have collegial relationships with the ethnic studies centers and an appreciation that goes beyond mere acceptance of the collaborative method of hiring FTEs sought by the ORUs. Neither did I find evidence that assignment of FTEs to the ethnic studies centers in furtherance of faculty diversity would conflict with goals for faculty hiring at the UCLA or UC levels. Dean Waugh spoke directly to an issue of concern you earlier raised:

*“Parenthetically, I should also add that I do not see this Initiative (FDI) as conflicting with the development of departments of ethnic studies. Those departments will, of course need to have a strong core faculty. Yet the campus should continue to develop the study of race and ethnicity beyond the confines of the ethnic studies departments and programs, and should ensure that*

*many programs have a stake in pursuing such scholarship and teaching as well as in diversifying their faculty.” June 27, 2003*

Both Dean Waugh and CODEO Chair, Katherine King urged that Women’s Studies be included in the FDI. I have already reviewed the remarkable success in gender equity the Center’s have achieved in their faculty appointments. It is particularly noteworthy that a number of ethnic studies faculty have also contributed significantly to Women’s Studies. To mention a few, Professors King Kok Cheung (English), Valerie Matusumoto (History), and Margorie Kagawa Singer (Public Health) are not only leading scholars in their respective fields, they have provided leadership to the IDP and ORU in Women’s Studies throughout their UCLA careers. It is therefore expected that the FDI would yield additional appointments of individuals with interest and expertise in various areas of Women’s Studies.

In addition, the FDI would have a positive impact on UCLA’s tradition of public and community service, which you recently affirmed in the UCLA in LA initiative. By that action, you renewed the campus commitment to be an active, engaged, and valued partner in greater Los Angeles, known internationally for its racial and cultural diversity. A diverse faculty would serve such programs well. We may expect that our welcome and success in the communities where we seek ties will depend in some measure on the emissaries we send and the relevance of our agenda to community needs. In the past, the ethnic studies centers and their faculty have forged close links with the region’s ethnic communities, and the success of these connections is evidenced by several supporting letters from community leaders (See Table 5)

## **Conclusions**

As I began to integrate the information and views that have been offered on the proposed Faculty Diversity Initiative, the task was made easier by the uncontestable merits of the goals set forth. The perspectives offered by Deans, Department Chairs, and Faculty have strongly reinforced this view. In this connection, the comment and recommendation of Dean Waugh seem particularly apropos:

*I have stressed on many occasions, diversity is one of the leading issues facing UCLA. I believe that the Faculty Diversity Initiative is a sound means of forwarding the goal of a more diverse faculty and urge you to adopt it in some way.*

**The endorsement of FDI by the leadership of the Academic Senate lends further support to the conclusion that the goal to increase the diversity of UCLA’s faculty is widely supported and of unquestionable value. A successful track record reaching back more than 25 years has established that faculty diversity can be furthered by the assignment of FTEs to the ethnic studies centers.**

The pursuit of a goal as important as faculty diversity needs to be marked by collaboration and the employment of varied means, particularly those of proven ability. The collaborative disposition evidenced in the endorsements received should also help to insure success.



Finally, I would add some perspectives from my extended experience at UCLA. Much has changed on our campus and in universities across the country since ethnic studies programs first emerged in the late 1960s. Indeed, such programs are so widely accepted in American higher education today that it is difficult to appreciate the tension and controversy that developed when they were first proposed. Similarly, the diversity of the university's faculty and student body has become a salient value, both on campus and in the broader community that UCLA, as a public university, serves.

The wisdom accumulated in the last several decades lends support for the view that efforts to diversify the curriculum, the faculty, and the student body are interrelated and reflect a broad and growing acceptance that a great university must serve society in ways far more profound than training its future workforce. Universities play a significant role in establishing a society's cultural menu. In what we study, in what we teach, we decide what is important and what will survive in the knowledge pool of generations to come. In *who* we teach, we extend the substantial benefits of higher education to individuals and communities and construct the social structures of tomorrow.

In developing a guiding philosophy for your tenure as Chancellor, you have urged that the UCLA family concentrate on excellence and stressed the importance of interdisciplinarity as a hallmark of the scholarship that engages the important social and scientific issues of our time. You have also affirmed UCLA's traditions of public and community service in the recently launched UCLA in LA initiative and renewed the campus' commitment to be an active, engaged, and valued partner in greater Los Angeles. The goals you have set forth constitute a critical anchor for my closing observations.

In my career, I have found it relatively rare to find such a high level of consensus on goals while having at hand the means to do what has proven workable and produced excellent results in the past. In the assignment of FTEs to the Centers for African American, American Indian, Asian American, and Chicano Studies, I believe we have an instance of that remarkable confluence.

The FDI is also timely as a means of enhancing campus momentum to advance the goal of faculty diversification. The appointments of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Community Partnerships add significantly to opportunities for synergy. In this connection, the Directors' have recommended that UCLA also harness another available strategic element in order to advance faculty diversity, the Faculty Fellows Program established by the University of California Office of the President. Thus far, this program has not had high visibility on the UCLA campus. Consideration should therefore be given to assigning responsibility to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity to implement the Faculty Fellows program and more effectively integrate it into campus diversity planning.

Based on the findings of this evaluation, I strongly urge you to implement the Faculty Diversity Initiative. Its potential for high campus impact is evident to all who have reviewed the proposal. The hiring strategy it entails will enable campus wide recruitment thereby producing a cohort of scholars who can contribute to ethnic studies and disciplinary and professional areas. The interface between these fields will also be expanded providing opportunities for scholarly innovation and the production of new knowledge. Scholars of such breadth and scope will no

doubt become a major asset in helping to achieve the campus' long-range goals of increasing diversity and interdisciplinarity. It is my conclusion that there is no comparable process or recruitment strategy for achieving campus diversity goals likely to yield results as promising as the *Faculty Diversity Initiative*.

copies: Rosina Becerra, Hanay Geiogamah, Darnell Hunt, Duncan Lindsey, Paula Lutomirski, Don Nakanishi, Daniel Neuman, Chon Noriega, Steve Olsen, Roberto Peccei, Donna Vredevoe, Scott Waugh

[1] Because of the small size of the ethnic studies faculty cohort three-year averages (1999-2002) have been employed in this report. Comparable college and professional school data are based on 1999 averages.

[2] See Table 2 listing internal letters of interest and support

[3] See recently completed 15-year reviews of the Centers.