With four years of survey data, UC Berkeley assessed search practices commonly thought to be effective in diversifying faculty hires.

- Results point to promising practices.
- Results suggest that we must move beyond “business as usual” to succeed in hiring top women and underrepresented minorities.

### Survey Goals:
Survey taken by nearly all faculty search committee chairs at Berkeley, 2012 – 2015. Asked “Did your search committee use this practice?”

### Five broad survey areas, covering 55 items:
1. Position specification
2. Active recruitment
3. Minimizing unconscious bias
4. Department commitment to diversity
5. Assessing campus-specific mechanisms

### Additional promising ways to shape job descriptions:
- Focus on public or engaged scholarship (e.g., architecture and affordable housing vs. architecture and urbanism).
- Focus on kinds of research that are attracting higher proportions of female and URM faculty. Example: “We are especially interested in applicants who do interdisciplinary work.”
- Pursue cluster hires of candidates with diverse backgrounds.

### Additional promising intensive efforts:
- Monitor national lists of fellowship recipients.
- Actively consider candidates with publications from less well-known journals/publications.
- Establish connections with institutions that grant Ph.D.s to diverse graduate students.

### Additional ways to prioritize diversity (somewhat promising):
- Develop a departmental diversity plan
- Arrange for diverse candidates to meet on campus with diverse groups/individuals.

### Caveats
- Some common practices that are not clearly promising:
- There may be other good reasons to compare hiring to peers.
- There may be good reasons to use these practices, but the study does not provide evidence in support.
- Make special efforts to be welcoming during recruitment.
- Focus on research promise as well as accomplishment.
- Offer faculty relocation services.

### About the Survey:
Survey taken by nearly all faculty search committee chairs at Berkeley, 2012 – 2015. Asked “Did your search committee use this practice?”

### Promising: Shaping Job Descriptions
- Example: Mentioned diversity issues in description
  - E.g., used “labor and women’s history” versus “labor history”
  - Impact: Increased diversity at every search stage.
- Caveats: Cannot be easily used in all disciplines.
- Programmatic needs can constrain choices.

### Promising: Intensive Outreach Efforts
- Example: Emailed/called diverse applicants
  - Directly identified and contacted diverse candidates and encouraged them to apply.
  - Impact: Increased representation of women and URM candidates at the short list stage and beyond.

### Promising: Prioritization of Diversity
- Example: Prioritized diversity and other needs
  - Clarified and prioritized the diversity needs of the department
  - Impact: Increased representation of URM applicants, short listed candidates and hires. Committees that did not engage in this practice selected and hired larger proportions of white men.

### Not Clearly Promising: Some Common Practices
- Example: Compared hiring to peer institutions
  - Compared relative success to peer institutions regarding diversity issues/hiring
  - Impact: No positive correlation with increased diversity.
- Additional practices that are not clearly promising:
  - There may be other good reasons to compare hiring to peers.
  - There may be good reasons to use these practices, but the study does not provide evidence in support.
  - Make special efforts to be welcoming during recruitment.
  - Focus on research promise as well as accomplishment.
  - Offer faculty relocation services.

### Additional Data Analyses: Search Committee Composition
- Example: Search committees with >40% women
  - Although our survey did not cover this practice, we were able to analyze the relevant data.
  - Impact: Adding women to search committees may help diversify hiring.

### Additional promising way to compose search committees:
- Have at least one URM faculty member on each search committee.

### Next Steps:
Surveying across the UC system with a larger sample to draw more definitive conclusions and examine disciplinary differences.