



Accountability for Inclusiveness of Climate

Linda Bisson, Associate Director, UCD ADVANCE

Accountability versus Responsibility

- Variable interpretations of these questions
- Who is responsible for climate?
- Who is accountable for climate?

Responsibility

	UCB	UCD	UCI	UCLA	UCM	UCR	UCSB	UCSC	UCSD	UCSF
Faculty		5	3	3	4	5	5	3	3	3
Chair		5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	3
Dean		4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	3
Other		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4

- Responsibility is distributed
- Primary responsibility lies with senior management personnel

Accountability

	UCB	UCD	UCI	UCLA	UCM	UCR	UCSB	UCSC	UCSD	UCSF
Faculty		5	1	1	2	1		2	3	2
Chair		5	2	5		5	5	3	3	3
Dean		4	3	5	4	2 > 5	5	4	3	3
Other		3	5			5	5	4		

- All hold faculty accountable for individual behavior under APM015 (misconduct); lower rankings were for accountability beyond own behavior
- Formal responsibilities for Chair accountability at some campuses
- Formal responsibilities for Dean accountability at some campuses

Training Resources

- Sexual Harassment as mandated (all)
- Implicit Bias Training (UCD mandatory for search committees; UCLA, UCR briefing/seminars for search committees)
- New Chair Training (UCD & UCSD mandatory; UCR)
- Optional Programs (UCI)
- Workshops (UCI, UCLA, UCR, UCSB, UCSD)
- Certificate Programs (UCI, UCSC)
- Ad Hoc (UCSF – targeted training as needed)

Actions Taken for Training “Failures”

- Training/Re-training
 - Coaching
 - Counseling
 - Role Change
 - Removal from office/termination
-
- Both formal and informal mechanisms are used
 - What is done is often case-by-case

Conclusions

- Numbers suggest variability in responsibility but descriptions of what the numbers meant indicate strong similarity
- Person most accountable varies but often Chair/Dean
- Chairs receive formal training on some but not all campuses, some optional, some mandatory
- Variability in training resources available and their application
- There are consequences for not addressing negative climate issues but they vary by position and type of issue