### Slide 1: UCB Faculty Hiring Levels, AY2012-13—2015-16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiring Level</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>% Yes**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made Long List</td>
<td>25,148</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made Short List</td>
<td>26,750</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made Proposed Cand.</td>
<td>27,623</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered Position</td>
<td>27,659</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted Position</td>
<td>27,701</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Applicants** | 27,899 | 100.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accepted Position</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>% Accept.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included above and going forward (220 job searches in total).

**% Yes=percentage of applicants among total applicants successfully advancing to specified hiring level.

**Slide 2: UCB Fac. Job Searches 2012-2015 (n=220*): Total Committee Members (median, mean) per Job Search, by Broad Field, Job Rank, Open/Closed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Field</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th># of Searches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTEM**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio. and Natural Res.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Fields*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten. Track (assist.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten./Ten. Track</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Search</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Search</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes all searches, even ones with more than 20% missing gender/ethnicity data for committee members.

**Physical Sciences, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics.**

**Physical Sciences, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics.**

*Searches with more than 20% missing gender/ethnicity data for committee members are excluded.


**Slide 3: UCB Fac. Job Searches 2012-2015 (n=164*): Total Committee Members (median, mean) per Job Search, by Broad Field, Job Rank, Open/Closed.**
Slide 4: UCB Fac. Job Searches 2012-2015* (n=220): Total Number of Applicants (median, mean) per Job Search, by Broad Field, Job Rank, Open/Closed

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included.

**Physical Sciences, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics.

Slide 5: UCB Fac. Job Searches 2012-2015* (n=220): Total Number of Short List (median, mean) per Job Search, by Broad Field, Job Rank, Open/Closed

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included.

**Physical Sciences, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics.

### Slide 6: UCB Fac. Job Searches 2012-2015* (n=220): Total Proposed Cand. (median, mean) per Job Search, by Broad Field, Job Rank, Open/Closed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th># of Searches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTEM**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio. and Natural Res.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten. Track (assist.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten./Ten. Track</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Search</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Search</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included.

**Physical Sciences, Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics.

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. 
***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response.
Slide 8: UCB Faculty Applicants, Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am.

***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response.

Slide 9: UCB Faculty Applicants, Diversity Pipeline, *Missing Data Excluded*, AY2012-13—2015-16*


*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am.
### Slide 10: UCB Faculty Applicants, Diversity Pipeline, *Missing Data Excluded*, AY2012-13—2015-16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Asian Women</th>
<th>URM** Women</th>
<th>URM** Men</th>
<th>Asian Men</th>
<th>White Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US PhD Pool (Ten. Track)</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB fac. applicants</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not make long-list</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made long-list</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made short-list</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed candidate</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered position</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted position</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New UCB Fac. 2013-2016</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew (short-list)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew (proposed)</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All withdrew</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am.

**Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response.

Slide 11: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*
Physical Sciences, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics

US PhD Pool (% means)
- White Women: 54.0%
- Asian Women: 8.7%
- Asian Men: 5.9%
- White Men: 5.9%
- URM** Women: 3.7%
- URM** Men: 5.9%
- Missing Data***: 0%

UCB fac. applicants
- White Women: 2529
- Asian Women: 1386
- Asian Men: 253
- White Men: 741
- URM** Women: 19
- URM** Men: 18
- Missing Data***: 10%

Made short-list
- White Women: 406
- Asian Women: 126
- Asian Men: 49
- White Men: 37
- URM** Women: 11
- URM** Men: 19
- Missing Data***: 20%

Proposed candidate
- White Women: 106
- Asian Women: 49
- Asian Men: 19
- White Men: 54
- URM** Women: 3
- URM** Men: 3
- Missing Data***: 30%

Offered position
- White Women: 38
- Asian Women: 16
- Asian Men: 3
- White Men: 11
- URM** Women: 2
- URM** Men: 2
- Missing Data***: 40%

Accepted position
- White Women: 34
- Asian Women: 13
- Asian Men: 2
- White Men: 9
- URM** Women: 2
- URM** Men: 2
- Missing Data***: 50%

All withdrew declined
- White Women: 29
- Asian Women: 12
- Asian Men: 2
- White Men: 6
- URM** Women: 1
- URM** Men: 1
- Missing Data***: 60%

Fac. search committee (sum)****
- White Women: 6
- Asian Women: 8
- Asian Men: 1
- White Men: 2
- URM** Women: 7
- URM** Men: 1
- Missing Data***: 80%

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****40 out of 47 searches included necessary data.
**Slide 12: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16* Physical Sciences, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics**

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **Includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****40 out of 47 searches included necessary data.

Slide 13: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*
Biological Sciences and Natural Resources

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****23 out of 37 searches included necessary data.

Biological Sciences and Natural Resources

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****23 out of 37 searches included necessary data.

### Professional Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Asian Women</th>
<th>URM** Women</th>
<th>URM** Men</th>
<th>Missing Data***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US PhD Pool (% means)</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB fac. applicants</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made short-list</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed candidate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered position</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted position</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All withdrew commission</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **Includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****39 out of 60 searches included necessary data.
*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****39 out of 60 searches included necessary data.

**Social Sciences**

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****31 out of 38 searches included necessary data.*

## Social Sciences

### Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Asian Women</th>
<th>URM** Women</th>
<th>URM** Men</th>
<th>Asian Men</th>
<th>White Men</th>
<th>Missing Data***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US PhD Pool</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB fac. applicants</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made short-list</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed candidate</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered position</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted position</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All declined</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac. search (sum)****</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **Includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****31 out of 38 searches included necessary data.

Slide 19: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*

**Humanities**

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****31 out of 38 searches included necessary data.

Slide 20: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*

Humans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Asian Women</th>
<th>URM** Women</th>
<th>URM** Men</th>
<th>Missing Data***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US PhD Pool</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Fac. appl.</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made short-list</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed cand.</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered pos.</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted pos.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All withdrew</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac. search com.</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sum)****</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****31 out of 38 searches included necessary data.

Slide 21: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16* Tenured Only Job Searches

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **Includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****16 out of 18 searches included necessary data.

Slide 22: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*
Tenured Only Job Searches

Tenured Only Job Searches

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****16 out of 18 searches included necessary data.

**Slide 23: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16**

**Tenure Track and Tenured Job Searches**

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****52 out of 74 searches included necessary data.*

Slide 24: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*
Tenure Track and Tenured Job Searches

- **White Women**
- **Asian Women**
- **URM** Women
- **URM** Men
- **Asian Men**
- **White Men**
- **Missing Data***

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****52 out of 74 searches included necessary data.

Slide 25: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*  
Tenure Track Only Job Searches

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am.  ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response.  ****96 out of 128 searches included necessary data.  
Slide 26: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*

Tenure Track Only Job Searches

![Bar chart showing the pipeline of UCB faculty applicant diversity across different stages of the hiring process.](image)

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **Includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****96 out of 128 searches included necessary data.

Closed or Specified Job Searches

- White Women: 42.6%
- Asian Women: 6.5%
- URM** Women: 7.4%
- URM** Men: 5.8%
- Asian Men: 32.9%
- White Men: 3.2%
- Missing Data***: 4%

US PhD Pool (% means)
- Made short-list: 42.6%
- Proposed candidate: 6.5%
- Offered position: 7.4%
- Accepted position: 5.8%
- All withdrew/declined: 32.9%

Faculty search committee (sum)****
- White Women: 241
- Asian Women: 40
- URM** Women: 27
- URM** Men: 30
- Asian Men: 103
- White Men: 40

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **Includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****95 out of 124 searches included necessary data.

Slide 28: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*

Closed or Specified Job Searches

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****95 out of 124 searches included necessary data.

**Slide 29: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16**

Open or Unspecified Job Searches

- **White Women***
- **Asian Women***
- **URM** Women
- **Asian Men***
- **White Men***
- **Missing Data***

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>Asian Women</th>
<th>URM Women</th>
<th>Asian Men</th>
<th>URM Men</th>
<th>Missing Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US PhD Pool</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Faculty Applicants</td>
<td>49.52</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made Short-list</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>4952</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Candidate</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered Position</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All declined</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac. search committee</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **Includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****69 out of 96 searches included necessary data.

Slide 30: UCB Faculty Applicant Diversity Pipeline, AY2012-13—2015-16*

Open or Unspecified Job Searches

- US PhD Pool (% means)
- UCB fac. applicants
- Made short-list
- Proposed candidate
- Offered position
- Accepted position
- All withdrew
- Declined
- Fac. search committee (sum)****

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **Includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am. ***Includes missing gender or ethnicity data, decline to state, and no demographic survey response. ****69 out of 96 searches included necessary data.

Slide 31: Total Headcount of UCB Faculty Hiring Committee Members (164 searches*) by Gender/Ethnicity, AY2012-13—2015-16

*Searches with more than 20% missing gender/ethnicity data for committee members are excluded.


### Slide 32: UCB Faculty Hiring, 2012-2015*: Modeling for individual applicant advancement through the levels, selected groups and controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Made Short List</th>
<th>Made Proposed</th>
<th>Accepted Offer</th>
<th>Withdrew (post-interview)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p-val</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p-val</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.487</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM**</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-0.385</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.876</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. only listing</td>
<td>-0.385</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open search</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relisted position</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of listing</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTEM***</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.270</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology/Nat. Res.</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.354</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Sch.</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-3.223</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.863</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion advancing compared to total group:
- **Women**: 1149 out of 27,899
- **URM**: 276 out of 1094
- **Asian**: 198 out of 233
- **Unknown**: 108 out of 1144

**Underrepresented Minority=Afric. Am., Hisp., Native Am. ** **Physical sciences, technology, engineering, & mathematics.**

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. Logistic regression is used in modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Not Used*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoided improper or unlawful questions related to gender, sexual orientat., race, ethnicity, religion, family status, pregnancy, internat. status, health status, age.</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established a welcoming environment for all interview finalists (i.e., sought to minimize any undue stress related to the interview process).</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated efficiently and respectfully with all faculty candidates/ finalists throughout the entire recruitment.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took the necessary time to fully evaluate all applications, carefully reviewing all materials (e.g., handbooks suggest spending 15-20 minutes per application).</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to make sure that the applicant pool/finalist group was as diverse as possible to support equitable evaluation of all candidates (i.e., research studies suggest...).</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated candidates using a broad holistic approach, focusing particularly on candidates areas of strength rather than narrowly defined areas of weakness....</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a variety of different settings/forums to evaluate/get-to-know interview finalists (e.g., from formal lectures to relaxed conversational settings...).</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed senior reviewers or equity advisors to monitor the equity of all recruitment related processes/decisions.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed broad hiring goals...that allowed the committee to be open to a wide range of candidates, including candidates from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated candidates based on their potential to develop a significant research program in their field (not exclusively based on their publication placement to date).</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted colleagues from other institutions to ask for their help in identifying potential applicants from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed post-hire support efforts for new faculty.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checked why candidates did not make the short list, including individuals from diverse backgrounds, explicitly identifying the reasons for de-selection.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established a search committee with individuals from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made clear to job finalists the possibility of research collaboration across departments and disciplines...in regard to areas of pressing societal concern....</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively considered candidates with degrees from a broad range of different institutional settings (e.g., PhDs from non-top-tier programs; HBCU/Hispanic serv.).</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed standard interview questions/job presentation criteria and made sure that all finalists had an opportunity to respond to all areas of inquiry....</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified candidates about possible dual-career couple employment options and family friendly polices/resources.</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertised widely, including in diversity specific venues (e.g., The Hispanic Outlook...).</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively considered candidates with publications from less well-known journals/publishers, carefully evaluating the quality of the work....</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes “Did not use,” “Not applicable,” “Not sure/other.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Not Used*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specified the position at the junior level where appl. pools tend to be more diverse.</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed internal search guides and/or made sure that committee members were aware of and reviewed campus and &quot;best practices&quot; related to diversity....</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly called/emailed possible candidates with diverse backgrounds and encouraged them to apply to the position.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged to have finalists meet with campus groups/individuals from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put out a call to the larger department...other [groups]...to help the hiring committee identify potential faculty applicants of diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a department/unit, clarified and prioritized the diversity needs of the department vs. competing needs....</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified in the job qualifications/evaluation criteria that demonstrated commitment to diversity, exp. with multicultural ed..., working w. diverse populations.</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established consistent departmental mechanisms to review the equity of all faculty searches....</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified the position in a disciplinary area with relatively high diversity of degree recipients/faculty (based on examination of demographic data or personal observation).</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematically examined applicant pool and availability data throughout recent faculty recruitments...to ensure diverse applicant pools, past and future.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed longer-term relationships with possible faculty candidates of diverse backgrounds via conferences, national organizations, faculty contacts, etc.</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored national resources that identify possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds (e.g., lists of recent fellowship recipients...).</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapped existing UC/UCB academic pipelines to diversify the applicant search pool (e.g., considered...UC Presidents Postdoctoral Fellowship recipients).</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported existing UC academic pipelines, from our undergrad to junior faculty, to develop, promote, and identify future faculty talent of diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed a &quot;champion,&quot; typically a faculty member, to advocate for candidates who may have been overlooked, including individuals from diverse backgrounds....</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examined and analyzed the history of departmental hiring in regard to equity issues (perhaps including an evaluation of past institutional affiliation of current faculty....).</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed in advance of reviewing applications a weighted rubric that was used in the evaluation of all candidates.</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codified the departments approach to dealing with pre-existing relationships between faculty candidates and hiring committee members....</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes “Did not use,” “Not applicable,” “Not sure/other.” Sources: UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Possible hiring methods used, from most common to least Used</th>
<th></th>
<th>Partial Used</th>
<th>Not Used*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Compared the relative success of our department to similar programs at peer institutions in re. to diversity-related issues and faculty hiring patterns....</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Conducted retrospective analyses of recent faculty recruitments in regard to diversity issues (e.g., Were the applicant pools/finalists appropriately diverse?...).</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Demonstrated a willingness to extend on-going faculty searches which have low diversity of applicant pools/finalists.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Appointed a departmental point person(s) to coordinate on-going recruitment efforts in regard to possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds....</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Developed or made use of programs/events that bring possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds to campus...(e.g., visiting scholar/postdoc...).</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Specified degree requirements in broad ways (e.g., did not explicitly restrict the search to Ph.D. recipients, allowing for other equivalent/appropriate...degrees).</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Supported faculty peer presentations...and discussions with hiring committees regarding faculty diversity and mitigating implicit associations.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Involved the Dean/other administrators in communicating with faculty about the importance of diversity in faculty recruitment....</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Promoted on-going relationships with institutions/departments/organizations known to grant PhDs to, or support research scholars from, diverse populations.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Instilled a sense of institutional accountability by monitoring the effectiveness of hiring diverse candidates through the years....</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Encouraged search committee members to attend trainings regarding issues of &quot;implicit associations&quot; and how to minimize their impact.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Developed multiple short-lists emphasizing different important qualifications (e.g., short-lists focused on teaching, contribution to diversity, service, research potential, etc.).</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Selected subject area(s) associated with &quot;public&quot; or &quot;engaged scholarship&quot;--fields focused on direct societal improvement, particularly in re. to underserved pop.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Considered and/or pursued cluster hires of candidates with diverse backgrounds (multiple faculty positions that are related...e.g., research clusters...).</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Developed a departmental diversity plan with specific plans-of-action and benchmarks to gauge their short-term and longer-term effectiveness.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Coupled the subject area with diversity issues (e.g., &quot;labor&quot; AND &quot;womens history&quot; vs. just &quot;labor history&quot;).</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Set aside/secured resources to support ongoing faculty recruitment activities in regard to individuals from diverse backgrounds (e.g., course relief...).</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes “Did not use,” “Not applicable,” “Not sure/other.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Hiring methods used (%) by Broad Field</th>
<th>PTEM*</th>
<th>Bio./Nat. Res.</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Social Scien.</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Specified the position in a disciplinary area with relatively high diversity of degree recipients/faculty (based on examination of demographic data or personal observation).</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Developed broad hiring goals...that allowed the committee to be open to a wide range of candidates, including candidates from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Specified the position at the junior level where appl. pools tend to be more diverse.</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Specified degree requirements in broad ways (e.g., did not explicitly restrict the search to Ph.D. recipients, allowing for other equivalent/appropriate...degrees).</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Coupled the subject area with diversity issues (e.g., &quot;labor&quot; AND &quot;womens history&quot; vs. just &quot;labor history&quot;).</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Selected subject area(s) associated with &quot;public&quot; or &quot;engaged scholarship&quot;--fields focused on direct societal improvement, particularly in re. to underserved pop.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Actively considered candidates with degrees from a broad range of different institutional settings (e.g., PhDs from non-top-tier programs; HBCU/Hispanic serv.).</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Actively considered candidates with publications from less well-known journals/publishers, carefully evaluating the quality of the work....</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Specified in the job qualifications/evaluation criteria that demonstrated commitment to diversity, exp. with multicultural ed..., working w. diverse populations.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Evaluated candidates based on their potential to develop a significant research program in their field (not exclusively based on their publication placement to date).</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Evaluated candidates using a broad holistic approach, focusing particularly on candidates areas of strength rather than narrowly defined areas of weakness....</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Developed multiple short-lists emphasizing different important qualifications (e.g., short-lists focused on teaching, contribution to diversity, service, research potential, etc.).</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Used a variety of different settings/frameworks to evaluate/get-to-know interview finalists (e.g., from formal lectures to relaxed conversational settings...).</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Developed longer-term relationships with possible faculty candidates of diverse backgrounds via conferences, national organizations, faculty contacts, etc.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Developed or made use of programs/events that bring possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds to campus...e.g., visiting scholar/postdoc...).</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Physical Sc., Technology, Eng., & Math. Red shading, less likely than Social Sciences to use the method (p<.10, lightest shading to p<.01, darkest shading); Green shading, more likely than Social Sciences to use the method. Tot. N: PTEM=48; Bio./Nat. Res.=37; Professional=60; Social Sciences=38; Humanities=37.

Slide 37: UCB Faculty Job Searches (n=220): Hiring methods used (%) by Broad Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>PTEM*</th>
<th>Bio./Nat. Res.</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Social Scien.</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Promoted on-going relationships with institutions/departments/organizations known to grant PhDs to, or support research scholars from, diverse populations.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 Monitored national resources that identify possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds (e.g., lists of recent fellowship recipients...).</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18 Supported existing UC academic pipelines, from our undergrad to junior faculty, to develop, promote, and identify future faculty talent of diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 Appointed a departmental point person(s) to coordinate on-going recruitment efforts in regard to possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds....</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 Set aside/secured resources to support ongoing faculty recruitment activities in regard to individuals from diverse backgrounds (e.g., course relief...).</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 Advertised widely, including in diversity specific venues (e.g., The Hispanic Outlook...).</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Put out a call to the larger department...other [groups]...to help the hiring committee identify potential faculty applicants of diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 Contacted colleagues from other institutions to ask for their help in identifying potential applicants from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 Directly called/emailed possible candidates with diverse backgrounds and encouraged them to apply to the position.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25 Tapped existing UC/UCB academic pipelines to diversify the applicant search pool (e.g., considered...UC Presidents Postdoctoral Fellowship recipients).</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26 Appointed a &quot;champion,&quot; typically a faculty member, to advocate for candidates who may have been overlooked, including individuals from diverse backgrounds....</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27 Established a welcoming environment for all interview finalists (i.e., sought to minimize any undue stress related to the interview process).</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28 Arranged to have finalists meet with campus groups/individuals from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29 Made clear to job finalists the possibility of research collaboration across departments and disciplines...in regard to areas of pressing societal concern....</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30 Notified candidates about possible dual-career couple employment options and family friendly policies/resources.</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Physical Sc., Technology, Eng., & Math. Red shading, less likely than Social Sciences to use the method (p<.10, lightest shading to p<.01, darkest shading); Green shading, more likely than Social Sciences to use the method. Tot. N: PTEM=48; Bio./Nat. Res.=37; Professional=60; Social Sciences=38; Humanities=37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PTEM*</th>
<th>Bio./Nat. Res.</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>Discussed post-hire support efforts for new faculty.</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>Communicated efficiently and respectfully with all faculty candidates/finalists throughout the entire recruitment.</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Established a search committee with individuals from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Encouraged search committee members to attend trainings regarding issues of &quot;implicit associations&quot; and how to minimize their impact.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>Developed in advance of reviewing applications a weighted rubric that was used in the evaluation of all candidates.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>Took the necessary time to fully evaluate all applications, carefully reviewing all materials (e.g., handbooks suggest spending 15-20 minutes per application).</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>Appointed senior reviewers or equity advisors to monitor the equity of all recruitment related processes/decisions.</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>Checked why candidates did not make the short list, including individuals from diverse backgrounds, explicitly identifying the reasons for de-selection.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>Tried to make sure that the applicant pool/finalist group was as diverse as possible to support equitable evaluation of all candidates (i.e., research studies suggest...).</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>Developed standard interview questions/job presentation criteria and made sure that all finalists had an opportunity to respond to all areas of inquiry....</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>Avoided improper or unlawful questions related to gender, sexual orientat., race, ethnicity, religion, family status, pregnancy, internat. status, health status, age....</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>As a department/unit, clarified and prioritized the diversity needs of the department vs. competing needs....</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>Developed a departmental diversity plan with specific plans-of-action and benchmarks to gauge their short-term and longer-term effectiveness.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>Examined and analyzed the history of departmental hiring in regard to equity issues (perhaps including an evaluation of past institutional affiliation of current faculty....).</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>Compared the relative success of our department to similar programs at peer institutions in re. to diversity-related issues and faculty hiring patterns....</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Physical Sc., Technology, Eng., & Math. Red shading, less likely than Social Sciences to use the method (p<.10, lightest shading to p<.01, darkest shading); Green shading, more likely than Social Sciences to use the method. Tot. N: PTEM=48; Bio./Nat. Res.=37; Professional=60; Social Sciences=38; Humanities=37.

### Slide 39: UCB Faculty Job Searches (n=220):
Hiring methods used (%) by Broad Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>PTEM*</th>
<th>Bio./Nat. Res.</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Social Scien.</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q46 Established consistent departmental mechanisms to review the equity of all faculty searches....</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47 Demonstrated a willingness to extend on-going faculty searches which have low diversity of applicant pools/finalists.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48 Considered and/or pursued cluster hires of candidates with diverse backgrounds (multiple faculty positions that are related...e.g., research clusters...).</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49 Involved the Dean/other administrators in communicating with faculty about the importance of diversity in faculty recruitment....</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50 Developed internal search guides and/or made sure that committee members were aware of and reviewed campus and &quot;best practices&quot; related to diversity....</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51 Supported faculty peer presentations...and discussions with hiring committees regarding faculty diversity and mitigating implicit associations.</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52 Codified the departments approach to dealing with pre-existing relationships between faculty candidates and hiring committee members....</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53 Systematically examined applicant pool and availability data throughout recent faculty recruitments...to ensure diverse applicant pools, past and future.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q54 Instilled a sense of institutional accountability by monitoring the effectiveness of hiring diverse candidates through the years....</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55 Conducted retrospective analyses of recent faculty recruitments in regard to diversity issues (e.g., Were the applicant pools/finalists appropriately diverse?...).</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Physical Sc., Technology, Eng., & Math. Red shading, less likely than Social Sciences to use the method (p<.10, lightest shading to p<.01, darkest shading); Green shading, more likely than Social Sciences to use the method. Tot. N: PTEM=48; Bio./Nat. Res.=37; Professional=60; Social Sciences=38; Humanities=37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p-val</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Specified in the job qualifications/evaluation criteria that demonstrated commitment to diversity, exp. with multicultural ed..., working w. diverse populations.</td>
<td>0.4303</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Evaluated candidates based on their potential to develop a significant research program in their field (not exclusively based on their publication placement to date).</td>
<td>0.3980</td>
<td>0.0515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Monitored national resources that identify possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds (e.g., lists of recent fellowship recipients...).</td>
<td>0.3236</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>Advertised widely, including in diversity specific venues (e.g., The Hispanic Outlook...).</td>
<td>0.3756</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Directly called/email ed possible candidates with diverse backgrounds and encouraged them to apply to the position.</td>
<td>0.2973</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>Tapped existing UC/UCB academic pipelines to diversify the applicant search pool (e.g., considered...UC Presidents Postdoctoral Fellowship recipients).</td>
<td>0.3421</td>
<td>0.0093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Encouraged search committee members to attend trainings regarding issues of &quot;implicit associations&quot; and how to minimize their impact.</td>
<td>0.2731</td>
<td>0.0576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>Developed in advance of reviewing applications a weighted rubric that was used in the evaluation of all candidates.</td>
<td>0.2233</td>
<td>0.0870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>Tried to make sure that the applicant pool/finalist group was as diverse as possible to support equitable evaluation of all candidates (i.e., research studies suggest...).</td>
<td>0.5138</td>
<td>0.0439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>As a department/unit, clarified and prioritized the diversity needs of the department vs. competing needs....</td>
<td>0.3406</td>
<td>0.0106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>Developed a departmental diversity plan with specific plans-of-action and benchmarks to gauge their short-term and longer-term effectiveness.</td>
<td>0.3518</td>
<td>0.0278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>Involved the Dean/other administrators in communicating with faculty about the importance of diversity in faculty recruitment....</td>
<td>0.3239</td>
<td>0.0256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>Supported faculty peer presentations...and discussions with hiring committees regarding faculty diversity and mitigating implicit associations.</td>
<td>0.3201</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td>Codified the departments approach to dealing with pre-existing relationships between faculty candidates and hiring committee members....</td>
<td>0.4385</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53</td>
<td>Systematically examined applicant pool and availability data throughout recent faculty recruitments...to ensure diverse applicant pools, past and future.</td>
<td>0.2798</td>
<td>0.0298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>Conducted retrospective analyses of recent faculty recruitments in regard to diversity issues (e.g., Were the applicant pools/finalists appropriately diverse?....).</td>
<td>0.2402</td>
<td>0.0718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on logistic regression. Dependent variable(s): 1=Used method, 0=Did not use/partial/other. Independent variables: Broad disciplinary field dummies, and linear calendar year of search; β and p-val values refer to calendar year variable. Dark green shading = p<.01; bright green = p<.05; light green = p<.10. Sources: UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).
Hiring Methods:

*Very Promising Search Practices*
Slide 41: Coupled the subject area with diversity issues (e.g., labor AND womens history vs. just labor history).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=43; partial use, N=16; Did not use, N=161.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 42: Selected subject area(s) associated with public or engaged scholarship
--fields focused on direct societal improvement, particularly in re. to underserved pop.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=48; partial use, N=24; Did not use, N=148.
Slide 43: Specified the position in a disciplinary area with relatively high diversity of degree recipients/faculty (based on examination of demographic data or personal observation).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

% Women
- Used Method
- Partial Use
- Did Not Use

% URM*
- Used Method
- Partial Use
- Did Not Use

% White Male
- Used Method
- Partial Use
- Did Not Use

Availability: % Women, % URM, % White Male
Applicants: % Women, % URM, % White Male
Short List: % Women, % URM, % White Male
Proposed: % Women, % URM, % White Male
Accepted: % Women, % URM, % White Male


# of job searches: used meth., N=112; partial use, N=21; Did not use, N=87.
Asian average 10.2% of the estimated U.S. faculty labor pool (U.S., PR) and 21.9% of UCB faculty applicants across 220 UCB job searches, 2012-2015*. 

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included.


Field linked to Gender, Sexuality, and/or Public Scholarship/Diversity

Women average 45.2% of the estimated U.S. faculty labor pool (U.S., PR) and 35.2% of UCB faculty applicants across 220 UCB job searches, 2012-2015*.

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included.

White women average 32.8% of the estimated U.S. faculty labor pool (U.S., PR) and 20.9% of UCB faculty applicants across 220 UCB job searches, 2012-2015*.

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included.

Asian women average 6.0% of the estimated U.S. faculty labor pool (U.S., PR) and 8.2% of UCB faculty applicants across 220 UCB job searches, 2012-2015*.

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included.


 URM** women average 7.4% of the estimated U.S. faculty labor pool (U.S., PR) and 4.3% of UCB faculty applicants across 220 UCB job searches, 2012-2015*.

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. **includes Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am.


Field linked to URM Race-Ethn. and/or Public Scholar.

URM** men average 6.4% of the estimated U.S. faculty labor pool (U.S., PR) and 6.3% of UCB faculty applicants across 220 UCB job searches, 2012-2015*.

Asian men average 5.1% of the estimated U.S. faculty labor pool (U.S., PR) and 13.7% of UCB faculty applicants across 220 UCB job searches, 2012-2015*.

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included.

y = 2.0032x + 0.0349
R² = 0.4495
White men average 42.2% of the estimated U.S. faculty labor pool (U.S., PR) and 36.8% of UCB faculty applicants across 220 UCB job searches, 2012-2015*.

*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included. URM = Afric. Am., Hisp., and Nat. Am.

### UCB Fac. Job Searches 2012-2015* (n=220): Modeling for % of actual applicants, linear regression, selected groups and controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>% women</th>
<th>p-val</th>
<th>% urm**</th>
<th>% asian</th>
<th>% white women</th>
<th>% asian women</th>
<th>% urm** women</th>
<th>% urm** men</th>
<th>% asian men</th>
<th>% white men</th>
<th>R-square</th>
<th>Adj. R-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% in availability pool</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>1.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. only listing</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open search</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relisted position</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of listing</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTEM***</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology/Nat. Res.</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Sch.</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of applicants</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Only searches with responses to the search methods survey are included.

Slide 54: Tapped existing UC/UCB academic pipelines to diversify the applicant search pool (e.g., considered...UC Presidents Postdoctoral Fellowship recipients).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

% Women

% URM*

% White Male

Availability  Applicants  Short List  Proposed  Accepted

# of job searches: used meth., N=100; partial use, N=20; Did not use, N=100.

Hiring Methods:

Promising Search Practices
Slide 55: Directly called/emailed possible candidates with diverse backgrounds and encouraged them to apply to the position.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=144; partial use, N=19; Did not use, N=57.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

Slide 56: As a department/unit, clarified and prioritized the diversity needs of the department vs. competing needs....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used Method</th>
<th>Partial Use</th>
<th>Did Not Use</th>
<th>% Women</th>
<th>% URM*</th>
<th>% White Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Short List</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| # of job searches: used method, N=128; partial use, N=32; Did not use, N=60.

Slide 57: Monitored national resources that identify possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds (e.g., lists of recent fellowship recipients...).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).


# of job searches: used meth., N=101; partial use, N=20; Did not use, N=99.
Hiring Methods:

Additional Practices Showing Some Promise
Slide 58: Developed a departmental diversity plan with specific plans-of-action and benchmarks to gauge their short-term and longer-term effectiveness.

- **Sources:** Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used method, N=46; partial use, N=34; Did not use, N=140.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.*

### Graphs:
- **% Women**
- **% URM**
- **% White Male**

Legend:
- **Used Method**
- **Partial Use**
- **Did Not Use**

**Categories:** Availability, Applicants, Short List, Proposed, Accepted


# of job searches: used method, N=46; partial use, N=34; Did not use, N=140.
Slide 59: Arranged to have finalists meet with campus groups/individuals from diverse backgrounds.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=137; partial use, N=29; Did not use, N=54.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Hiring Methods:

Not Clearly Promising Search Practices

Practices for Which We Observed Insufficient Variation
Slide 60: Avoided improper or unlawful questions related to gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, religion, family status, pregnancy, international status, health status, age etc.

**Sources:** Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used method, N=215; partial use, N=4; Did not use, N=1.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Short List</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% URM*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slide 61: Established a welcoming environment for all interview finalists (i.e., sought to minimize any undue stress related to the interview process).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used Method</th>
<th>Partial Use</th>
<th>Did Not Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Women

% URM*

% White Male

Availability | Applicants | Short List | Proposed | Accepted
0%           | 10%        | 20%        | 30%      | 40%

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=210; partial use, N=6; Did not use, N=4.
Slide 62: Communicated efficiently and respectfully with all faculty candidates & finalists throughout the entire recruitment.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- # of job searches: used meth., N=210; partial use, N=7; Did not use, N=3.
Slide 63: Took the necessary time to fully evaluate all applications, carefully reviewing all materials (e.g., handbooks suggest spending 15-20 minutes per application).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=205; partial use, N=12;  Did not use, N=3.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.*
Slide 64: Tried to make sure that the applicant pool/finalist group was as diverse as possible to support equitable evaluation of all candidates (i.e., research studies suggest...).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=201; partial use, N=11; Did not use, N=8.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 65: Evaluated candidates using a broad holistic approach, focusing particularly on candidates areas of strength rather than narrowly defined areas of weakness.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used method, N=200; partial use, N=10; did not use, N=10.

Slide 66: Used a variety of different settings/forums to evaluate/get-to-know interview finalists (e.g., from formal lectures to relaxed conversational settings...).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).


# of job searches: used meth., N=199; partial use, N=8; Did not use, N=13.
Slide 67: Appointed senior reviewers or equity advisors to monitor the equity of all recruitment related processes/decisions.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used method, N=199; partial use, N=9; Did not use, N=12.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 68: Developed broad hiring goals...that allowed the committee to be open to a wide range of candidates, including candidates from diverse backgrounds.
Slide 69: Evaluated candidates based on their potential to develop a significant research program in their field (not exclusively based on their publication placement to date).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used method, N=192; partial use, N=22; did not use, N=6.
Slide 70: Contacted colleagues from other institutions to ask for their help in identifying potential applicants from diverse backgrounds.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=188; partial use, N=19; Did not use, N=13.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 71: Discussed post-hire support efforts for new faculty.

Slide 71: Discussed post-hire support efforts for new faculty.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=186; partial use, N=13; Did not use, N=21.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 72: Checked why candidates did not make the short list, including individuals from diverse backgrounds, explicitly identifying the reasons for de-selection.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

# of job searches: used meth., N=181; partial use, N=20; Did not use, N=19.
Slide 73: Established a search committee with individuals from diverse backgrounds.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=174; partial use, N=31; Did not use, N=15.
Slide 74: Actively considered candidates with degrees from a broad range of different institutional settings (e.g., PhDs from non-top-tier programs; HBCU/Hispanic serv.).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=167; partial use, N=26; Did not use, N=27.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=167; partial use, N=28; Did not use, N=25.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 76: Specified the position at the junior level where appl. pools tend to be more diverse.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- % Women
- % URM* (includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.)
- % White Male

Availability, Applicants, Short List, Proposed, Accepted

# of job searches: used meth., N=152; partial use, N=47; Did not use, N=21.
Slide 77: Set aside/secured resources to support ongoing faculty recruitment activities in regard to individuals from diverse backgrounds (e.g., course relief...).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=23; partial use, N=11; Did not use, N=186.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Hiring Methods:

Not Clearly Promising Search Practices

- Negative Associations or High Interest Items with Unclear Findings
Slide 78: Compared the relative success of our department to similar programs at peer institutions in re. to diversity-related issues and faculty hiring patterns....

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=79; partial use, N=29; Did not use, N=112.

Slide 79: Examined and analyzed the history of departmental hiring in regard to equity issues (perhaps including an evaluation of past institutional affiliation of current faculty....).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=98; partial use, N=29; did not use, N=93.

Slide 80: Systematically examined applicant pool and availability data throughout recent faculty recruitments...to ensure diverse applicant pools, past and future.

- Used Method
- Partial Use
- Did Not Use

**% Women**

**% URM***

**% White Male**

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).


# of job searches: used meth., N=110; partial use, N=27; Did not use, N=83.
Slide 81: Supported faculty peer presentations...and discussions with hiring committees regarding faculty diversity and mitigating implicit associations.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

Graph showing the distribution of women, URM* (Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.), and white males across different stages of the hiring process: availability, applicants, short list, proposed, and accepted. The graph includes bars for used method, partial use, and did not use.
Encouraged search committee members to attend trainings regarding issues of implicit associations and how to minimize their impact.
Slide 83: Developed in advance of reviewing applications a weighted rubric that was used in the evaluation of all candidates.

- **Used Method**
- **Partial Use**
- **Did Not Use**

### % Women
- Availability
- Applicants
- Short List
- Proposed
- Accepted

### % URM*
- Availability
- Applicants
- Short List
- Proposed
- Accepted

### % White Male
- Availability
- Applicants
- Short List
- Proposed
- Accepted


Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=92; partial use, N=29; did not use, N=99.
Slide 84: Considered and/or pursued cluster hires of candidates with diverse backgrounds
(multiple faculty positions that are related...e.g., research clusters...).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=48; partial use, N=19; Did not use, N=153.

Slide 85: Specified in the job qualifications/evaluation criteria that demonstrated commitment to diversity, exp. with multicultural ed..., working w. diverse populations.

Used Method | Partial Use | Did Not Use
---|---|---
% Women
% URM*
% White Male
Availability | Applicants | Short List | Proposed | Accepted

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

Hiring Methods:

Not Clearly Promising Search Practices

Inconclusive Patterns
Slide 86: Specified degree requirements in broad ways
(e.g., did not explicitly restrict the search to Ph.D. recipients, allowing for other equivalent/appropriate...degrees).

Source: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- % Women
- % URM*
- % White Male

- Availability
- Applicants
- Short List
- Proposed
- Accepted

- Used Method
- Partial Use
- Did Not Use


# of job searches: used meth., N=70; partial use, N=23; Did not use, N=127.
Slide 87: Actively considered candidates with publications from less well-known journals/publishers, carefully evaluating the quality of the work...
Slide 88: Developed multiple short-lists emphasizing different important qualifications (e.g., short-lists focused on teaching, contribution to diversity, service, research potential, etc.).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- # of job searches: used method, N=50; partial use, N=36; did not use, N=134.

Slide 89: Developed longer-term relationships with possible faculty candidates of diverse backgrounds via conferences, national organizations, faculty contacts, etc.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=106; partial use, N=39; did not use, N=75.

Slide 90: Developed or made use of programs/events that bring possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds to campus...(e.g., visiting scholar/postdoc...).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=74; partial use, N=41; Did not use, N=105.

Slide 91: Promoted on-going relationships with institutions/departments/organizations known to grant PhDs to, or support research scholars from, diverse populations.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).


# of job searches: used meth., N=67; partial use, N=34; Did not use, N=119.
Slide 92: Supported existing UC academic pipelines, from our undergrad to junior faculty, to develop, promote, and identify future faculty talent of diverse backgrounds.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=99; partial use, N=22; Did not use, N=99.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 93: Appointed a departmental point person(s) to coordinate on-going recruitment efforts in regard to possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

% Women

% URM* [includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.]

% White Male

Availability
Applicants
Short List
Proposed
Accepted

# of job searches: used meth., N=75; partial use, N=13; Did not use, N=132.
Slide 94: Advertised widely, including in diversity specific venues (e.g., The Hispanic Outlook...).

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- # of job searches: used meth., N=156; partial use, N=24; Did not use, N=40.

Slide 95: Put out a call to the larger department...other [groups]
...to help the hiring committee identify potential faculty applicants of diverse backgrounds.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

# of job searches: used meth., N=131; partial use, N=35; Did not use, N=54.
Slide 96: Appointed a champion, typically a faculty member, to advocate for candidates who may have been overlooked, including individuals from diverse backgrounds.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=99; partial use, N=26; Did not use, N=95.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 97: Made clear to job finalists the possibility of research collaboration across departments and disciplines ...in regard to areas of pressing societal concern....

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

% Women
- Used Method
- Partial Use
- Did Not Use

% URM*
- Includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

% White Male

Availability | Applicants | Short List | Proposed | Accepted
---|---|---|---|---

# of job searches: used meth., N=168; partial use, N=14; Did not use, N=38.
Slide 98: Notified candidates about possible dual-career couple employment options and family friendly polices/resources.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=158; partial use, N=17; Did not use, N=45.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 99: Established consistent departmental mechanisms to review the equity of all faculty searches.

- **% Women**: Used Method > Partial Use > Did Not Use
- **% URM***: Used Method > Partial Use > Did Not Use
- **% White Male**: Used Method > Partial Use > Did Not Use


- **Availability**: Used Method > Partial Use > Did Not Use
- **Applicants**: Used Method > Partial Use > Did Not Use
- **Short List**: Used Method > Partial Use > Did Not Use
- **Proposed**: Used Method > Partial Use > Did Not Use
- **Accepted**: Used Method > Partial Use > Did Not Use

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

---

# of job searches: used meth., N=119; partial use, N=19; Did not use, N=82.
Slide 100: Demonstrated a willingness to extend on-going faculty searches which have low diversity of applicant pools/finalists.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

# of job searches: used meth., N=76; partial use, N=14; Did not use, N=130.
Slide 101: Involved the Dean/other administrators in communicating with faculty about the importance of diversity in faculty recruitment….

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60%
Used Method Partial Use Did Not Use

% Women

% URM*

% White Male

Availability Applicants Short List Proposed Accepted

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

# of job searches: used meth., N=69; partial use, N=17; Did not use, N=134.
Slide 102: Developed internal search guides
and/or made sure that committee members were aware of and reviewed campus and best practices related to diversity....

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=150; partial use, N=28; Did not use, N=42.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 103: Codified the departments approach to dealing with pre-existing relationships between faculty candidates and hiring committee members.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

% Women

% URM*

% White Male

Availability | Applicants | Short List | Proposed | Accepted
---|---|---|---|---

Used Method | Partial Use | Did Not Use

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

# of job searches: used method, N=83; partial use, N=20; Did not use, N=117.
Slide 104: Instilled a sense of institutional accountability by monitoring the effectiveness of hiring diverse candidates through the years.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: used meth., N=65; partial use, N=31; Did not use, N=124.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 105: Conducted retrospective analyses of recent faculty recruitments in regard to diversity issues (e.g., Were the applicant pools/finalists appropriately diverse?...).

Sliders: 100% Used Method, 50% Partial Use, 0% Did Not Use.

- **% Women**:
  - Availability: Used Method 40%, Partial Use 30%, Did Not Use 20%.
  - Applicants: Used Method 40%, Partial Use 30%, Did Not Use 20%.
  - Short List: Used Method 40%, Partial Use 30%, Did Not Use 20%.
  - Proposed: Used Method 40%, Partial Use 30%, Did Not Use 20%.
  - Accepted: Used Method 40%, Partial Use 30%, Did Not Use 20%.

- **% URM***: (includes Afric. Am., Hisp., Nat. Am.)
  - Availability: Used Method 10%, Partial Use 20%, Did Not Use 30%.
  - Applicants: Used Method 10%, Partial Use 20%, Did Not Use 30%.
  - Short List: Used Method 10%, Partial Use 20%, Did Not Use 30%.
  - Proposed: Used Method 10%, Partial Use 20%, Did Not Use 30%.
  - Accepted: Used Method 10%, Partial Use 20%, Did Not Use 30%.

- **% White Male**
  - Availability: Used Method 60%, Partial Use 40%, Did Not Use 20%.
  - Applicants: Used Method 60%, Partial Use 40%, Did Not Use 20%.
  - Short List: Used Method 60%, Partial Use 40%, Did Not Use 20%.
  - Proposed: Used Method 60%, Partial Use 40%, Did Not Use 20%.
  - Accepted: Used Method 60%, Partial Use 40%, Did Not Use 20%.

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

# of job searches: used meth., N=78; partial use, N=25; Did not use, N=117.
Hiring Methods:

*Methods Grouped by Factor Analysis*
### Slide 106: Identified Factors*: UCB Faculty Hiring Methods

#### Factor 1: Prioritized & Institutionalized Diversity Concerns As a Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hiring Methods</th>
<th>Corr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qr44</td>
<td>Examined and analyzed the history of departmental hiring in regard to equity issues (perhaps including an evaluation of past institutional affiliation of current faculty....).</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr45</td>
<td>Compared the relative success of our department to similar programs at peer institutions in re. to diversity-related issues and faculty hiring patterns....</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr55</td>
<td>Conducted retrospective analyses of recent faculty recruitments in regard to diversity issues (e.g., Were the applicant pools/finalists approp. diverse?).</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr42</td>
<td>As a department/unit, clarified and prioritized the diversity needs of the department vs. competing needs....</td>
<td>0.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr43</td>
<td>Developed a departmental diversity plan with specific plans-of-action and benchmarks to gauge their short-term and longer-term effectiveness.</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr53</td>
<td>Systematically examined applicant pool and availability data throughout recent faculty recruitments...to ensure diverse applicant pools, past and future.</td>
<td>0.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr54</td>
<td>Instilled a sense of institutional accountability by monitoring the effectiveness of hiring diverse candidates through the years....</td>
<td>0.493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's alpha: Raw 0.82; Standardized 0.82.

*Using SAS factor analysis with promax rotation, see: [http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm](http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm)

Slide 107: Factor 1: Prioritized/Institutionalized Diversity Concerns as a Department

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: High Quart., N=67; Mid Quarts., N=121; Low Quart., N=32.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
### Identified Factors*: UCB Faculty Hiring Methods

#### Factor 2: Niche Hiring, Shared Mission, & Collegiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiring Methods</th>
<th>Corr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>qr5</strong> Coupled the subject area with diversity issues (e.g., &quot;labor&quot; AND &quot;womens history&quot; vs. just &quot;labor history&quot;).</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>qr6</strong> Selected subject area(s) associated with &quot;public&quot; or &quot;engaged scholarship&quot;--fields focused on direct societal improvement, particularly in re. to underserved pop.</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>qr16</strong> Promoted on-going relationships with institutions/departments/organizations known to grant PhDs to, or support research scholars from, diverse populations.</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>qr29</strong> Made clear to job finalists the possibility of research collaboration across departments and disciplines...in regard to areas of pressing societal concern....</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>qr28</strong> Arranged to have finalists meet with campus groups/individuals from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>0.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>qr1</strong> Specified the position in a disciplinary area with relatively high diversity of degree recipients/faculty (based on examination of demographic data or personal observation).</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cronbach's alpha: Raw 0.66; Standardized 0.66.**

---

*Using SAS factor analysis with promax rotation, see: [http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm](http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm)

Slide 109: Factor 2: Niche Hiring, Shared Mission, & Collegiality

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- % Women
- % URM*
- % White Male

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

# of job searches: High Quart., N=43; Mid Quarts., N=128; Low Quart., N=49.
## Slide 110: Identified Factors*: UCB Faculty Hiring Methods

### Factor 3: Employed Proactive “Best Practices” and Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hiring Methods</th>
<th>Corr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qr50</td>
<td>Developed internal search guides and/or made sure that committee members were aware of and reviewed campus and &quot;best practices&quot; related to diversity....</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr8</td>
<td>Actively considered candidates with publications from less well-known journals/publishers, carefully evaluating the quality of the work....</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr7</td>
<td>Actively considered candidates with degrees from a broad range of different institutional settings (e.g., PhDs from non-top-tier programs; HBCU/Hispanic serv.).</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr25</td>
<td>Tapped existing UC/UCB academic pipelines to diversify the applicant search pool (e.g., considered...UC Presidents Postdoctoral Fellowship recipients).</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr39</td>
<td>Tried to make sure that the applicant pool/finalist group was as diverse as possible to support equitable evaluation of all candidates (i.e., research studies suggest...).</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's alpha: Raw 0.61; Standardized 0.62.

*Using SAS factor analysis with promax rotation, see: [http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm](http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm)

**Slide 111: Factor 3: Employed Proactive “Best Practices” and Flexibility**

- **Highest Quartile of Use**
- **Mid Quartiles**
- **Lowest Quartile**

### Availability
- % Women
- % URM*
- % White Male

### Applicants
- % Women
- % URM*
- % White Male

### Short List
- % Women
- % URM*
- % White Male

### Proposed
- % Women
- % URM*
- % White Male

### Accepted
- % Women
- % URM*
- % White Male


Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).
### Slide 112: Identified Factors*: UCB Faculty Hiring Methods

#### Factor 4: Intensive Recruitment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiring Methods</th>
<th>Corr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qr15   Developed or made use of programs/events that bring possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds to campus...(e.g., visiting scholar/postdoc...).</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr14   Developed longer-term relationships with possible faculty candidates of diverse backgrounds via conferences, national organizations, faculty contacts, etc.</td>
<td>0.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr24   Directly called/emailed possible candidates with diverse backgrounds and encouraged them to apply to the position.</td>
<td>0.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr17   Monitored national resources that identify possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds (e.g., lists of recent fellowship recipients...).</td>
<td>0.421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's alpha: Raw 0.66; Standardized 0.66.

*Using SAS factor analysis with promax rotation, see: [http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm](http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm)

Slide 113: Factor 4: Intensive Recruitment Methods

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: High Quart., N=84; Mid Quarts., N=76; Low Quart., N=60.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
### Slide 114: Identified Factors*: UCB Faculty Hiring Methods

**Factor 5: Implicit Bias, Peer Presentations, Resources, & Rubrics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corr.</th>
<th>Hiring Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qr51</td>
<td>Supported faculty peer presentations...and discussions with hiring committees regarding faculty diversity and mitigating implicit associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr20</td>
<td>Set aside/secured resources to support ongoing faculty recruitment activities in regard to individuals from diverse backgrounds (e.g., course relief...).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr34</td>
<td>Encouraged search committee members to attend trainings regarding issues of &quot;implicit associations&quot; and how to minimize their impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr35</td>
<td>Developed in advance of reviewing applications a weighted rubric that was used in the evaluation of all candidates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's alpha: Raw 0.55; Standardized 0.56.

**Factor 6: Employed Traditional Equity Mechanisms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corr.</th>
<th>Hiring Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qr46</td>
<td>Established consistent departmental mechanisms to review the equity of all faculty searches....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr52</td>
<td>Codified the departments approach to dealing with pre-existing relationships between faculty candidates and hiring committee members....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr47</td>
<td>Demonstrated a willingness to extend on-going faculty searches which have low diversity of applicant pools/finalists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's alpha: Raw 0.58; Standardized 0.58.

*Using SAS factor analysis with promax rotation, see: [http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm](http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm)

Slide 115: Factor 5: Implicit Bias, Peer Presentations, Resources, & Rubrics

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- Highest Quartile of Use
- Mid Quartiles
- Lowest Quartile

# of job searches: High Quart., N=75; Mid Quart., N=72; Low Quart., N=73.

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
Slide 116: Factor 6: Employed Traditional Equity Mechanisms

- **% Women**: Highest Quartile of Use > Mid Quartiles > Lowest Quartile
- **% URM***: Availability > Applicants > Short List > Proposed > Accepted
- **% White Male**: Availability = Applicants = Short List = Proposed = Accepted


Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: High Quart., N=47; Mid Quarts., N=111; Low Quart., N=62.
## Identified Factors*: UCB Faculty Hiring Methods

### Factor 7: Dual Career and Faculty Support Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corr.</th>
<th>Hiring Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>qr31 Discussed post-hire support efforts for new faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>qr30 Notified candidates about possible dual-career couple employment options and family friendly policies/resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's alpha: Raw 0.53; Standardized 0.54.

### Factor 8: Champion or Point Person and Degree Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corr.</th>
<th>Hiring Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>qr26 Appointed a &quot;champion,&quot; typically a faculty member, to advocate for candidates who may have been overlooked, including individuals from diverse backgrounds....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>qr4 Specified degree requirements in broad ways (e.g., did not explicitly restrict the search to Ph.D. recipients, allowing for other equivalent/appropriate...degrees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>qr19 Appointed a departmental point person(s) to coordinate on-going recruitment efforts in regard to possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's alpha: Raw 0.46; Standardized 0.55.

*Using SAS factor analysis with promax rotation, see: [http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm](http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm)

Slide 118: Factor 7: Dual Career and Faculty Support Options

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- # of job searches: High Quartile, N=148; Mid Quartile, N=14; Low Quartile, N=58.
Slide 119: Factor 8: Champion or Point Person and Degree Flexibility

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

# of job searches: High Quart., N=35; Mid Quarts., N=117; Low Quart., N=68.
### Slide 120: Identified Factors*: UCB Faculty Hiring Methods

**Factor 9: Holistic Evaluation, Junior Level, Focused on Potential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corr.</th>
<th>Hiring Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qr10</td>
<td>Evaluated candidates based on their potential to develop a significant research program in their field (not exclusively based on their publication placement to date).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr3</td>
<td>Specified the position at the junior level where appl. pools tend to be more diverse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr11</td>
<td>Evaluated candidates using a broad holistic approach, focusing particularly on candidates areas of strength rather than narrowly defined areas of weakness....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cronbach’s alpha: Raw 0.47; Standardized 0.50.**

---

**Factor 10: Open and Welcoming Recruitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corr.</th>
<th>Hiring Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qr23</td>
<td>Contacted colleagues from other institutions to ask for their help in identifying potential applicants from diverse backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr27</td>
<td>Established a welcoming environment for all interview finalists (i.e., sought to minimize any undue stress related to the interview process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr21</td>
<td>Advertised widely, including in diversity specific venues (e.g., The Hispanic Outlook...).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cronbach’s alpha: Raw 0.38; Standardized 0.43.**

Slide 121: Factor 9: Holistic Evaluation, Junior Level, Focused on Potential

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- Highest Quartile of Use
- Mid Quartiles
- Lowest Quartile

- % Women
- % URM* (includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.)
- % White Male

Availability - Applicants - Short List - Proposed - Accepted

# of job searches: High Quart., N=133; Mid Quarts., N=47; Low Quart., N=40.
Slide 122: Factor 10: Open and Welcoming Recruitment

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

*includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.

# of job searches: High Quart., N=139; Mid Quarts., N=23; Low Quart., N=58.
## Identified Factors*: UCB Faculty Hiring Methods

### Hiring Methods Weakly Correlated with Other Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Developed broad hiring goals...that allowed the committee to be open to a wide range of candidates, including candidates from diverse backgrounds.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Specified in the job qualifications/evaluation criteria that demonstrated commitment to diversity, exp. with multicultural ed..., working w. diverse populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Developed multiple short-lists emphasizing different important qualifications (e.g., short-lists focused on teaching, contribution to diversity, service, research potential, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Used a variety of different settings/forums to evaluate/get-to-know interview finalists (e.g., from formal lectures to relaxed conversational settings...).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Supported existing UC academic pipelines, from our undergrad to junior faculty, to develop, promote, and identify future faculty talent of diverse backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>Put out a call to the larger department...other [groups]...to help the hiring committee identify potential faculty applicants of diverse backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>Communicated efficiently and respectfully with all faculty candidates/ finalists throughout the entire recruitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Established a search committee with individuals from diverse backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>Took the necessary time to fully evaluate all applications, carefully reviewing all materials (e.g., handbooks suggest spending 15-20 minutes per application).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>Appointed senior reviewers or equity advisors to monitor the equity of all recruitment related processes/decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>Checked why candidates did not make the short list, including individuals from diverse backgrounds, explicitly identifying the reasons for de-selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>Developed standard interview questions/job presentation criteria and made sure that all finalists had an opportunity to respond to all areas of inquiry....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>Avoided improper or unlawful questions related to gender, sexual orientat., race, ethnicity, religion, family status, pregnancy, internat. status, health status, age....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>Considered and/or pursued cluster hires of candidates with diverse backgrounds (multiple faculty positions that are related...e.g., research clusters...).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>Involved the Dean/other administrators in communicating with faculty about the importance of diversity in faculty recruitment....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Using  SAS factor analysis with promax rotation, see: [http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm](http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm)

Existing Hiring Mechanisms and Resources
Slide 124: Usefulness of Existing Mechanisms Designed to Promote Diverse Faculty Pools and Hires at UC Berkeley


*Northern California Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC)
Slide 125: Usefulness of Mechanisms Designed to Promote Diversity: Faculty Search Plans

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- % Women
- % URM*: includes Afric. Am., Hisp., & Nat. Am.
- % White Male

Availability: # of job searches: very useful, N=100; somewhat, N=81; not useful, N=35.
Slide 126: Usefulness of Mechanisms Designed to Promote Diversity: Faculty Search Reports

- **Very Useful**
- **Somewhat Useful**
- **Not Useful**

**% Women**
- Availability: 50%
- Applicants: 40%
- Short List: 30%
- Proposed: 20%
- Accepted: 10%

**% URM***
- Availability: 30%
- Applicants: 20%
- Short List: 10%
- Proposed: 0%
- Accepted: 0%

**% White Male**
- Availability: 70%
- Applicants: 60%
- Short List: 50%
- Proposed: 40%
- Accepted: 30%

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).


# of job searches: very useful, N=61; somewhat, N=73; not useful, N=81.
Slide 127: Usefulness of Mechanisms Designed to Promote Diversity: OFEW and APO Webpages

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

Very Useful | Somewhat Useful | Not Useful

% Women

% URM*

% White Male

Availability | Applicants | Short List | Proposed | Accepted

# of job searches: very useful, N=68; somewhat, N=89; not useful, N=50.

Slide 128: Usefulness of Mechanisms Designed to Promote Diversity: OFEW Search Guide

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

- **Very Useful**
- **Somewhat Useful**
- **Not Useful**

### % Women

- Availability
- Applicants
- Short List
- Proposed
- Accepted

### % URM*

- Availability
- Applicants
- Short List
- Proposed
- Accepted

### % White Male

- Availability
- Applicants
- Short List
- Proposed
- Accepted


# of job searches: very useful, N=77; somewhat, N=92; not useful, N=37.
Slide 129: Usefulness of Mechanisms Designed to Promote Diversity:
Faculty Search Workshops

- **Very Useful**
- **Somewhat Useful**
- **Not Useful**

### % Women

- Availability
- Applicants
- Short List
- Proposed
- Accepted

### % URM*

- Availability
- Applicants
- Short List
- Proposed
- Accepted

### % White Male

- Availability
- Applicants
- Short List
- Proposed
- Accepted

**Sources:** Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).


# of job searches: very useful, N=73; somewhat, N=79; not useful, N=34.
Slide 130: Usefulness of Mechanisms Designed to Promote Diversity: Faculty Equity Advisors

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).

# of job searches: very useful, N=91; somewhat, N=71; not useful, N=30.

Hiring Committee Composition
Slide 131: Search Committee Demography: 40% or More Female Committee (yes/no)

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).


# of job searches: 40% Female Comm., N=52; Less than 40%, N=112.
Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).
Slide 133: Search Committee Demography: 60% or More White Male (yes/no)

Sources: Survey of Earned Doctorates (US, PR); UCB AP Recruit 2012-13—2015-16 (as of 9/28/2016).


# of job searches: 60%+ White Male Comm., N=57; Less than 60%, N=107.
**Slide 134: UCB Fac. Job Searches 2012-2015 (n=164*): Modeling for % of actual applicants, linear regression, selected groups and controls including hiring committee demography**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>% women β</th>
<th>p-val</th>
<th>% urm** β</th>
<th>p-val</th>
<th>% asian β</th>
<th>p-val</th>
<th>% white women β</th>
<th>p-val</th>
<th>% asian women β</th>
<th>p-val</th>
<th>% urm** women β</th>
<th>p-val</th>
<th>% urm** men β</th>
<th>p-val</th>
<th>% asian men β</th>
<th>p-val</th>
<th>% white men β</th>
<th>p-val</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% in availability pool</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. only listing</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open search</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relisted position</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of listing</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTEM***</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology/Nat. Res.</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Sch.</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of applicants</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in hiring committee</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-square</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-square</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Underrepresented Minority=Afric. Am., Hisp., Native Am. ***Physical sciences, technology, engineering, & mathematics.**

*Searches with more than 20% missing gender/ethnicity data for committee members are excluded.*