On October 10 – 12, 2007 thirty-eight department chairs, vice chairs, directors and faculty members representing STEM fields, as well as the behavioral sciences, attended and participated in a retreat at UCLA’s Lake Arrowhead Conference Center focused on advancing faculty diversity in their departments. Five campuses were represented as part of the NSF PAID Partnership for Faculty Equity and Diversity: UCI, UCLA, UCR, UCSB and UCSD. Over the course of the meeting, chairs discussed their role in enabling equal opportunity and equity in recruitment, advancement and faculty recognition, as well as fostering a welcoming, transparent and inclusive department climate.

**Retreat Objectives:**

- To provide chairs with a shared understanding of their role as a leader and change agent in the department.
- To provide chairs with practices to enhance the recruitment and hiring of a more diverse faculty.
- To provide chairs with practices to improve faculty mentoring for promotion and advancement.
- To increase the chair’s understanding of how to build faculty morale and create a climate of inclusion within the department.
- To development chair’s understanding of interpersonal communication techniques in a number of situations, including handling conflicts and developing departmental consensus.
- To enable personal and individual insights into behavioral style, biases and diversity issues.

This material is based upon work supported, in part, by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. SBE-0620123. Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.
sustain policies that promote diversity and recruitment processes. You can reward department members who actively promote diversity, and you can outline concrete plans involved in recruitment and retention. So I really say it is in your hands in a lot of ways, whether we’re successful [at UC] or not.

Regarding Diversifying Faculty Searches

[It’s] a bandwidth problem. I’ve always viewed it that way. Departments at universities often have to hire people in very specialized areas to put together critical groups for grants, to put together a critical base for doing great things, for achieving great advances in knowledge. And that often means recruitment in pretty specialized areas and that means you may be dealing with not a very diverse pool because you have such a restricted number of people who fit the description. And I would say it is OK for departments to make some very specialized hires to help develop the academic quality of the department as long as there’s some balance that there are other searches that have much wider bandwidth, where the chance of diversity is much greater. And I really see that this is a portfolio and you always have to be alert to the fact that if you hire highly specialized individuals it’s very difficult to get the type of pool you’d like to get to be diverse, but you can have other searches that are much broader. So … if you’re in a neuroscience department you may be hiring someone pretty specialized in dealing with neurochemistry …and that may be a very restricted pool and not very diverse. On the other hand, if you have other searches that open up to animal behavior and broader areas, you can find a more diverse pool. I think that the problem is that many departments over-specialize in every one of their hires. Every hire is so over-specified that you never see the kinds of pools that you need (to become diverse). …If you can broaden the bandwidth of your searches, you can often bring in a much more diverse pool of candidates, so I think that’s an important issue one has to deal with, and I think there’s a balance there. There’s a balance that can be achieved.

…it’s not true in every search but in many searches, we do have 3 or 4 people where the distinctions are pretty fine. And the one thing that I have learned, and I learned it in an interesting way from a close colleague of mine, is that you can’t always tell 5 years out who’s going to be the most successful.

On the Importance of Mentoring New Faculty Members

(Speaking of experiences at the University of Virginia)… We also created a mentoring program….These were really for young faculty, incoming faculty. It was open to everybody but it was really primarily focused on women faculty and on minority faculty from underrepresented groups…a number [of the mentees] were in the sciences. It was a home to sort of get together to talk about experiences, but it was a place where you could get access to information about stopping the clock, and whether that was a good or bad thing and what it meant. You could get access to information about the whole tenure process, and you got a lot of people talking to you plus you have a mentor assigned to you….The reviews of the faculty that were involved were just spectacular. It was high touch and labor intensive. The faculty who were mentors spent a lot of time. Everyone thought it was worthwhile and extremely valuable activity so I think that mentoring plus the training of search committees were two of the important elements [in diversifying the faculty at University of Virginia].

Importance of Choice of Fields

I noticed at least with the University of Virginia, when we grew the opportunities in biomedical engineering, we dramatically grew the number of women engineers entering the Engineering School. They were interested in just different engineering than men were interested in, and there were a disproportionate number of women…in biomedical engineering, biological engineering fields, so something about the choice of the fields that you decide to invest in will affect your diversity.

Making Progress

I think we can make progress…[On our campuses] there’s economic diversity [of the student body]. We’re starting at such a great base, at a place that is really the school of dreams for most students. I couldn’t imagine a better place to be doing this work. You’re here because you’re committed, I’m committed, and we’ll work together and we’ll look back in ten years and say, “Wow. You know we’re actually begun and we’re actually succeeding in solving this still very serious challenge.”

The “Gene Block Rule”:

We cannot predict the future: We do not know which candidate will be the best in five years time; nor do we know if next year’s pool will net candidates as strong as those we have today.
Challenges in Recruiting, Retaining & Advancing a Diverse Faculty

The program began with a group discussion facilitated by Dr. Susan Bryant, Vice Chancellor for Research at UCI and a Professor of Developmental & Cell Biology, who had also served as the Principal Investigator on UCI’s ADVANCE IT AWARD. Participants were encouraged to raise the challenges they faced in recruiting, retaining and advancing a diverse faculty, as well as any recommendations of successful practices in these areas.

The group cited a number of issues and challenges for recruiting a diverse faculty, including over reliance on established candidate networks, lack of critical mass for underrepresented groups which makes recruitment less attractive, allowing gender schemas to shape the evaluation of candidates, limited FTE resources that restrict a department’s ability to hire dual academic career couples and the general perception of academia as not family friendly or balanced in terms of work/life.

During discussion about advancing faculty members and enabling a welcoming, inclusive climate, the group cited a number of issues and challenges including, lack of equity in off-scale salaries, addressing the “loyalty tax” whereby those who stay with the institution longer fall further behind in salary compared to those who are more recently hired, uneven awareness and utilization of career equity reviews and tenure clock stoppage, and differences between men and women in terms of negotiation styles or the tendency to self-promote. In addition the group discussed inequity between women and underrepresented minority faculty members and their white male counterparts in terms of having strong support networks and access to information about the “rules” for advancement. Differences between public and private institutional cultures was discussed in terms of willingness to nominate faculty members for awards or other types of recognition.

The group discussed a number of strategies for enhancing recruitment and advancement, including those listed in the column to the right.

Strategies for Recruitment

1. Raise awareness about recruitment process and best practices within the department.
2. Review department’s past hiring record and availability data; use data driven evaluation of practices.
3. Consider recruitment in combination with department’s strategic plan.
4. Consider the effects of implicit bias.
5. Communicate about family friendly resources with all candidates.
6. Increase your probabilities by broadening criteria and hiring multiple people at once:
   — Use parallel hires, bundle ads, pool hires and cluster hires

Strategies for Advancement

1. Actively develop networks inside and outside the units/Chair to assist in building networks and connections for new faculty.
2. Mentor Associate Professors.
3. Develop strategies for award nominations:
   — networks
   — a departmental nomination process
   — awards committee
   — VC of Research reminds colleagues to consider people for awards
   — Solicit letters/nominations from external promotion letter writers
   — Contact Academy members within institution
Dr. Brian Nosek, a National Institutes of Medicine PI for “A Virtual Laboratory in the Social Behavioral Sciences” and faculty member in the department of psychology at the University of Virginia, delivered a presentation which focused on the interaction of the person and his or her context, especially influences that occur outside conscious awareness or control. He provided demonstrations involving visual perception, automatic inferential processes that assist in “filling in the gaps” when sensation is ambiguous or incomplete, the counting passes demo, which showed that attention is vital for directing processing amid an overwhelming amount of information and a construction demo, where participants made assumptions about what they expected to see which influenced what they did see. In the Implicit Association Test demo, it was shown that associations exist in our minds that may be quite different than our values or endorsed ideas.

Mind Bugs: The Ordinary Origins of Bias

Dr. Brian Nosek, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Virginia

Prior experience and exposure provides assumptions or frames for interpreting and responding to the behavior of others. Social expectations can influence judgment in surprising and unexpected ways. Such influences may contradict our intended actions. We must pay attention and exert conscious effort to counteract such influences when evaluating others.

Dr. Brian Nosek demonstrating the effects of visual perception and face recognition.
Two case studies were discussed during the retreat, both based on a fictional department of Evolutionary Biology at “Pacific Coast University.” Participants were provided with background about the department, it’s faculty members, demographics, student demographics, department climate and recent policy changes.

In Part 1: Faculty Hiring Decision, participants were asked to work in small groups to review three abbreviated CV’s of candidates for an Assistant Professor position. A copy of the Call for Applications was also provided in the case. As part of their discussion, each group was asked to think about the factors that proved important in their deliberations. Following the small group discussions, a debrief of the entire group was led by Dr. Rosina Becerra. During this debrief, questions were posed regarding:

- Academic qualifications & fit with department
- Departmental strategic planning
- Candidate’s contribution to diversity
- Student mentoring & student demographics
- Influence/content of the Position Announcement
- Departmental climate for women
- Strategies for recruitment and negotiation
- Hiring more than one candidate

Participants discussed the criteria they used in their deliberations, which included academic qualification, academic fit with the department, contribution to diversity, student demographics, mentoring, candidate’s ability to collaborate and bridge, as well as fit with the job description. Some groups recommended trying to hire two of the three candidates.

During the large group discussion, issues raised included how and when to discuss personal work/life issues with candidates, the problem of “losing time” in making offers to candidates who ultimately turn down an offer, effect of the department’s reputation in terms of being welcoming for women and underrepresented minorities and the importance (in a real hiring situation) of the candidate’s interaction with students and faculty members when making a selection.

Ideas for improving the recruitment and selection process included:

- List positive strengths of all candidates instead of immediately creating one rank ordered list.
- Be a player, be competitive and put your best foot forward with every recruitment. This will help with future hires.
- First, focus on the candidate’s qualifications for the position. Later when recruiting your top choice, find out about wants/needs to bring the person here. Ask the candidate “What would it take to bring you here?”

The discussion concluded with a summary of some of the key roles that a department chair plays in the recruitment and hiring process.

See also, Faculty Recruitment section of Retreat notebook for additional strategies to increase diversity and equity in the recruitment process.

**Chair’s Role in Recruitment & Hiring**

1. Make people aware of APM 210 and the importance of diversity research, teaching and service to the university.
2. Pay attention to the composition of the Search Committee.
3. Don’t ask about work/life issues, instead investigate needs when recruiting candidates. Ask the recruit, “What would it take to bring you here?”
4. “Charge” the search committee at the beginning of the search process and discuss criteria to be considered by the search committee.
5. Review the wording of the job ad. Make it broad and inclusive.
6. Ask the Search Committee for a second look through the applicants for “interesting” people in the pool.
7. Use the “Gene Block Rule” – Realize that we don’t know the future: Who will be the best 5 years from now? Will we have such a qualified candidate in the pool next year?
Leading Department Change: The Case of Evolutionary Biology

Part 2: Advancement to Tenure

Using the same fictional department of Evolutionary Biology that was discussed in Part 1, participants were asked to work in small groups to review one of two department ad hoc committee reports on a faculty member’s advancement to tenure. Groups were asked to engage in discussion about the merits of the faculty member who was up for tenure review, as if they were members of the department preparing to vote. They were asked to reflect on the criteria they used in their deliberations, any areas for more information, and important issues the group discussed. Individually, participants were asked to note the key elements that they would include in a Chair Letter regarding the tenure decision. Following the small group discussions, a debrief of the entire group was led by Dr. Rosina Becerra. During this debrief questions were posed regarding:

- Criteria Used for Evaluation
- Teaching
- Diversity Service
- Stop-the-Clock
- Departmental Climate Issues
- Mentoring and Advising
- The Chair’s Letter
- Role of the Chair in Faculty Advancement

One of the cases involved a faculty member who had devoted considerable time to diversity-related service, teaching and mentoring. Groups did not reach consensus on the tenure decision for this candidate, advising that the decision be delayed a year. Questions were raised about the mentoring and feedback the faculty member had received, the number of grants, as well as his ongoing research relationship with his Graduate advisor. An overall question was raised regarding how we, as an institution, can encourage diversity-related service and student mentoring, without jeopardizing the career advancement of junior faculty members.

The other case involved a faculty member who had devoted considerable time and effort to becoming an excellent teacher, and who had used the stop-the-clock policies during her pre-tenure period. In this case, some of the groups reached a positive vote for her tenure, while others had a mixed vote. Discussion included the quality of her research, lack of Ph.D. graduates, her impact on the field and the strength of her grant support.

Overall criteria that the groups applied to both candidates for tenure included:

- Years and quality of publication
- Independence of research
- Visibility
- Research productivity
- Impact on the field
- Issue of too much service

Agreed upon factors to include in the Chair’s Letter:

- Trajectory
- Impact on field
- Explore anomalies
- Document the quality of teaching

Teaching

Much discussion in the larger group revolved around issues related to teaching, including the methods used to evaluate teaching, including student’s evaluation of teaching. Participants noted that students often make gender-related comments and rate women and underrepresented minority faculty lower, when they challenge student’s beliefs. Participants also commented on the differences between teaching large undergraduate courses and smaller graduate seminars and the idea that the Chair should match people with their teaching strengths. It was also noted that teaching effectiveness goes well beyond classroom teaching alone.

Mentoring

The chair’s role in mentoring junior faculty was raised. Comments included the chair’s responsibility for identifying faculty members who can provide strong mentoring, for ensuring that mentoring relationships are established and that effective mentoring occurs, but that it may not be best for the chair to be the primary source of mentoring for junior faculty members.

See also, Writing the Chair’s Letter on page D-31 in the Case Study section of the Retreat notebook.
Advancing and Mentoring Faculty: Panel Discussion

A panel discussion on Advancing and Mentoring Faculty was moderated by Dr. Jorge Huerta, Associate Chancellor and Chief Diversity Officer, UCSD.

Panelists included Jodie Holt, Chair, Plant Physiology, UCR, Keith Marzullo, Chair, Computer Science & Engineering, UCSD, Victoria Sork, Chair, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, UCLA and John T. Woolley, Chair, Political Science, UCSB. They shared personal insights and their own experiences related to enabling mentoring for junior faculty colleagues. All the panelists commented that formalized mentoring assignments didn’t work well with their faculty.

John Woolley discussed methods his department uses to provide career advice to junior faculty, including the chair taking all of the junior faculty members to lunch, as a group, once per quarter. The department also provides junior faculty networking events. The chair also meets with junior faculty members each quarter to talk about where they are in the review cycle. Woolley said he helps to build professional networks by bringing people to campus for a talk, from the same area as junior faculty members.

Keith Marzullo raised a number of challenges to mentoring in his department. He said that assigned mentors don’t seem to work and that issues of friendship sometimes get in the way of providing objective advice and feedback. He suggested the idea of providing a mentor committee to overcome the problems of different people providing conflicting advice.

Jodie Holt discussed a number of ways that she helps new faculty members become part of the academic community, including emailing every unit to introduce a new faculty member, providing contact information and encouraging others to make contact. She also provides pre-arrival assistance such as a departmental purchasing list, and names of potential faculty collaborators for grants. She also explained many ways that different offices keep in touch with new faculty members.

Victoria Sork raised the idea that one-on-one mentoring may be an outdated model and that new models for career advising should include more than one point of reference for faculty members. She provided the example of a group of junior faculty members in the psychology department getting together regularly for group mentoring and communicating information. She discussed the chair’s role in advancing and mentoring junior faculty in terms of making things transparent and providing communication and clarification about the culture. She also said that women and minorities often have fewer contacts.

Alternate forms of mentoring include group mentoring, different mentors on specific areas verses one global mentor for everything, and mentoring from outside the department for work/life issues. Investing in a good start for new faculty and helping them develop a network within the academic community benefits everyone and contributes to higher faculty retention in the long term.

See also:

Giving and Getting Career Advice: A Guide for Junior and Senior Faculty, NSF ADVANCE at the University of Michigan.
http://www.umich.edu/~advproj/career%20advising.pdf

Faculty Mentoring Program Guidelines, p. G-3 in Mentoring & Advancement section of Retreat notebook.

Mentoring Tips, p. G-6 in Mentoring & Advancement section of Retreat notebook.
Managing Conflict Strategically  
*J. Michael Chennault & Dr. Yolanda Moses*

J. Michael Chennault, Ombudsman, UCI presented a model for managing conflict strategically. The model included five behavioral approaches to conflict, including avoidance, accommodation, competition, compromise and collaboration. Participants completed an assessment that revealed their preferred response to conflict. Chennault reviewed both positive and negative applications of the different approaches to conflict. In any conflict situation, it is important to be self aware, actively listen, delay reacting immediately, think beyond your own individual interests and be adaptive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Positive Use</th>
<th>Negative Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>• When tensions are high and you need to regain composure</td>
<td>• Avoiding a timely decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When costs outweigh benefits</td>
<td>• Not confronting difficult matters or negative behaviors by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When you need time to gather information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When there are power differentials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td>• When the issue is more important to others than to you</td>
<td>• When you give up too much for the sake of harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To preserve harmony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>• When goals are moderately important</td>
<td>• If the mutual gain and loss is beyond 50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When colleagues of equal power are strongly committed to mutually exclusive goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To achieve a temporary settlement of complex issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To arrive at an expedient solution under time pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When collaboration fails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>• When creative, team effort is required</td>
<td>• Most time consuming approach to conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When you desire to end conflict instead of table it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When you want to work through hard feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When you want to gain commitment by consensual decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>• When people compete against the problem and not each other</td>
<td>• When the objective is to win at all costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also: *Bridging Departmental Divides*, p. C-3 in Behavior, Communication & Conflict section of Retreat notebook.
Prior to attending the Retreat, participants were asked to complete a brief on-line survey in which they rated their department on 25 items related to climate for faculty members. Using the same items as this survey, participants engaged in small group discussions about the relative importance of the items in terms of retaining faculty members. In the small group exercise, participants were asked to reach consensus on the top 10 items. The results from these surveys and activities appear below and on page 10.

Dr. Rosina Becerra led a large group discussion on the chair’s role in faculty retention, department climate and culture. A number of areas of impact were discussed:

**Areas of Chair Impact – Faculty Retention & Department Climate**

- Set the tone, build an atmosphere of transparency, communication and recognition.
- Maintain a climate of respectful treatment.
- Specifically address an “inclusive” environment.
- Advocate for faculty in all areas, identify additional sources of funding, etc.
- In evaluation, influence the merit/promotion process.
- Pay attention to equity issues.
- Provide recognition /visibility for work—value faculty members.
- Lead and influence.
- Communicate information.
- Chairs have influence over many factors. Need to trade-off or balance among them.

The group also shared a number of ways to recognize and reward faculty members:

- Offer praise.
- Provide special departmental awards
- Create a graduate mentor award
- Create an overall departmental award.
- Pay attention to what faculty need, e.g. “best” TA’s.
- Develop an awards committee who nominates faculty for awards.
- Feature faculty members on the department’s web page.
- Keep a list on the web of all awards & make sure people are nominated.

See also, *Actions for Enhancing Department Climate* on page H-6 and *Creating a Positive Departmental Climate: Principles for Best Practices* on page H-2 of the Retention & Climate section of the Retreat notebook.

See also, *Ways to Bring Recognition to Your Faculty* on page G-7 and *Faculty Professional Development Opportunities* on page G-8 of the Mentoring & Advancement section of the Retreat notebook.

Also *University of Washington’s Faculty Retention Toolkit*, www.engr.washington.edu/advance/resources/Retention

---

**Pre-Retreat Survey**

*Incorporates Responses from UCI, UCLA, UCR, UCSB and UCSD*

**Overall Rating for own Department Climate**

On a scale of 1-10 with 10 being best
Rating of Current Department/Campus Faculty Climate Factors
Lowest Ranked on a scale of 1-10 with 10 Being Best

Group Consensus Ranking: Top Climate Factors that Affect Faculty Retention

1. Competitive salary
2. Quality of colleagues
3. Quality of graduate students
4. Affordable/quality of housing
5. Fair and equitable evaluation (merit increases, promotions)
6. Supportive/colllegial department atmosphere
7. Reasonable teaching load
8. Quality of facilities, lab space, etc.
9. Research support
10. Recognition/visibility/value for work, contributions and ideas
11. Spousal/partner hiring opportunities
12. Opportunities to collaborate w/colleagues
13. Effective policies/balance between work and family/personal life
14. Respectful treatment/consideration & politeness
Sheila O'Rourke Assistant Vice Provost, Equity and Diversity for UCOP presented data on the demographic profile of women and minority faculty at UC, as well as the demographic profile of the national pool and UC peer institutions. While the pool of underrepresented minorities (URM) and women scholars grows, UC faculty changes more slowly. Especially in the Sciences and Engineering, hiring of women and underrepresented minorities within the UC lags behind the availability of qualified candidates. In addition to hiring, retention plays a critical role. One significant contribution that the University of California could make to increasing the national pool of URM faculty lies in improving graduate diversity, especially in the STEM fields.

Shelia O'Rourke
The Report of the President’s Task Force on Faculty Diversity is available at:

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/facultydiversity/report.html

Updated demographic data on UC faculty is available at:

http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/datamgmt/welcome.html

Insights into NSF Broadening Participation Goals

Alice Hogan
Chief Administrative Officer, Asian University for Women and Founding Director, NSF ADVANCE Program

Alice Hogan, the founding director, of the ADVANCE program, provided an overview of the commitments of NSF to institutional transformation in academic science and outlined the importance of science participation as a priority in the grant review process across the divisions of the physical sciences. She reviewed the legislative underpinnings for the work of the NSF, including the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunity Act to assist the United States in the “full development and use of the science and engineering talents of men and women, equally, of all ethnic, racial and economic backgrounds” as well as those talents of persons with disabilities. She also cited research funding of $50 billion over 10 years as part of the American Competitiveness Initiative.

In the NSF Strategic Plan 2006 – 2011, NSF is dedicated to “being broadly inclusive: seeking and accommodating contributions from all sources while reaching out especially to groups that have been underrepresented; serving scientists, engineers, educators, students and the public across the nation; and exploring every opportunity for partnerships, both nationally and internationally.” Investing in American’s
In his closing remarks to Retreat participants, Dr. Douglas M. Haynes reiterated that our intentionality about diversity is central to our going forward. Intentionality means the capacity to incorporate diversity as a continuing priority—in strategic planning, recruitment, advancement and rewards, and succession planning. Intentionality may be rendered in three goals that chairs influence.

Chairs should:

1. Foster a culture of inclusion and transparency.
2. Ensure equal opportunity in faculty recruitment.
3. Promote equity in faculty advancement.

In addition, gender equity and diversity should not be the responsibility of women or underrepresented minority faculty alone. By becoming more knowledgeable about diversity and equity in the recruitment and review processes and as a university value, Chairs benefit the entire unit as a reliable resource. To this end, familiarize yourself with the hiring performance of your unit, division and campus. Setting expectations and highlighting activity in advancing diversity are preconditions for evaluating faculty labor. This applies to the chair’s letter in personnel actions, as well as to the evaluations of deans, provosts and chancellors for appointment or reappointment.

With your own faculty, discuss the data, learn about the revisions to the UC Academic Personnel Manual (APM 210, 240 and 245) and share this information with faculty members. Pay attention to search committees and the search process. Recognize contributions to programs that encourage science participation by underrepresented groups. Raise the awareness of and encourage utilization of family friendly resources and partner benefits to help improve the work/life climate.

Over the next two years, a number of Leading Through Diversity programs are scheduled or are currently being implemented.
planned. These are the second Senior Administrators Symposium on January 23, 2008 at UCLA and the second Chair’s Retreat in the Fall of 2008. Meanwhile, additional programming at partnership campuses will be held. For further information, please visit the Leading Through Diversity website: www.paid.uci.edu. Thank you again for making this Leading Through Diversity Department Chair’s Retreat a success. ■

Partnership for Faculty Equity and Diversity Principal Investigators & Key Personnel

Principal Investigator
Herbert P. Killackey
Vice Provost, Academic Personnel, UCI

Douglas M. Haynes
Director, UCI ADVANCE Program for Faculty Equity and Diversity, UCI

Co-Principal Investigators
Rosina M. Becerra
Vice Provost, Faculty Diversity & Development, UCLA

Maria Herrera-Sobek
Associate Vice Chancellor, Diversity, Equity and Academic Policy, UCSD

Jorge A. Huerta
Associate Chancellor and Chief Diversity Officer, UCSD

Yolanda Moses
Associate Vice Chancellor for Excellence & Diversity, UCR

Key Personnel
Glynna Davis
Director, Campus Diversity Initiatives, UCSD

Dina Jankowski
UCI ADVANCE Program Coordinator, UCI

Marlene Zuk
Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Equity and Diversity, UCR

Participants
UCI
Don Blake, Chair, Chemistry
Simon Cole, Vice Chair, Criminology, Law & Society
David Dooley, Chair, Psychology & Social Behavior
David Feldman, Chair, Planning, Policy & Design
Jean-Luc Gaudiot, Chair, Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
Brandon S. Gaut, Chair, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
David F. Redmiles, Chair, Informatics

UCLA
Art Arnold, Chair, Physiological Science
Jiun-Shyan (JS) Chen, Chair, Civil & Environmental Engineering
Ferdinand Coroniti, Chair, Physics & Astronomy
Jan de Leeuw, Chair, Statistics
Miguel Garcia-Garibay, Vice Chair, Chemistry & Biochemistry
David D. Jackson, Chair, Earth & Space Science
Adrienne Lavine, Chair, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Hal Monbouquette, Chair, Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering
Anne Peplau, Vice Chair, Psychology
Victoria Sork, Chair, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Christoph Thiele, Chair, Mathematics

UCR
Alicia Arrizon, Chair, Women’s Studies
Ring Carde, Chair, Entomology
Jodie Holt, Chair, Botany and Plant Sciences
Neal Schiller, Associate Dean, Biomedical Sciences

UCSB
Eileen Boris, Chair, Women’s Studies
Oliver Chadwick, Chair, Geography
Jeff Dozier, Chair, Environmental Science Management
Peter Kuhn, Chair, Economics
Mark Srednicki, Chair, Physics
Michael Stohl, Chair, Communications
Alec Wodtke, Chair, Chemistry & Biochemistry
John Woolley, Chair, Political Science
Andy Wyss, Vice Chair, Earth Science

UCSD
Eric Bakovic, Associate Professor, Linguistics
Sam Buss, Chair, Mathematics
Robert Continetti, Chair, Chemistry & Biochemistry
Larry Larson, Chair, Electrical & Computer Engineering
Keith Marzullo, Chair, Computer Science & Engineering
Jaime Pineda, Associate Professor, Cognitive Sciences
Randall Souviney, Director, Education Studies

Support Staff
Andrés Aguilar
Coordinator, Graphics & Media, Faculty Diversity & Development, UCLA
Lori Davison
Administrative Analyst, Faculty Diversity & Development, UCLA

http://www.paid.uci.edu/