

Achieving Equity and Diversity in Faculty Recruitment: Research & Practice

Conference Report

This report is a synopsis and synthesis of the *Achieving Equity and Diversity in Faculty Recruitment: Research & Practice* conference, hosted by the NSF-funded *Evaluating Equity in Faculty Recruitment* (EEFR) project. The conference took place at the University of California (UC), Davis on April 26, 2019, and was preceded by a half-day Researcher Workshop. More than 100 faculty and administrators convened to engage with topics related to the conference topic via presentations and discussions of empirical studies and programmatic interventions. This report covers the public conference.

Conference Goals:

To convene members of the national community of researchers, faculty, and administrators seeking to ensure excellence, equity, and diversity in faculty recruitment in order to (1) share insights from empirical studies of the factors that generate disparities in faculty recruitment and interventions aimed at increasing equity; (2) translate the empirical evidence into actionable information for faculty hiring policies and practices; and (3) facilitate ongoing communication among the community members.

Co-PIs of the EEFR project:

Kimberlee Shauman, UC Davis

Catherine Albiston, School of Law, UC Berkeley

Susan Carlson, Vice Provost Academic Personnel and Programs, UC Office of the President

Victoria Plaut, School of Law, UC Berkeley

Marc Goulden, Director of Data Initiatives, Office for the Faculty, UC Berkeley

Conference funded by:

National Science Foundation ECR Grants 1535509 and 1535435.

Conference co-sponsors:

University of California, Office of the President, Academic Personnel and Programs

University of California, Davis, Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

This report was compiled by the EEFR team with excellent research and writing assistance from Kyneshawau Hurd. Readers should contact the presenters for detailed information about the work they presented.



Conference and Research Workshop Presenters

- Catherine Albiston** — Jackson H. Ralston Professor of Law and of Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley.
- Sharla Alegria** — Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Merced.
- Monica Biernat** — Distinguished Professor of Psychology at the University of Kansas.
- Mary Blair-Loy** — Professor of Sociology and Director of the Center for Research on Gender in Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and Medicine (STEMM) at the University of California, San Diego.
- Janet Broughton** — Vice Provost for the Faculty, Emerita, at the University of California, Berkeley, and Professor Emerita of Philosophy.
- NiCole Buchanan** — Associate Professor of Psychology at Michigan State University.
- Susan Carlson** — Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs at the University of California, Office of the President, and Professor of English at the University of California, Davis.
- Shelley Correll** — Michelle Mercer and Bruce Golden Family Professor of Women’s Leadership and Director of the Clayman Institute for Gender Research and the VMware Women’s Leadership Innovation Lab at Stanford University.
- Frank Dobbin** — Professor of Sociology at Harvard University.
- Eve Fine** — Associate Scientist and Director of Curriculum Development and Implementation at the Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI) at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Karie Frasch** — Director of the Office for Faculty Equity & Welfare at the University of California, Berkeley.
- Marc Goulden** — Director of Data Initiatives at the University of California, Berkeley.
- Douglas M. Haynes** — Vice Provost for Academic Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and Professor of Modern European History and at the University of California, Irvine.
- Ralph Hexter** — Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor at the University of California, Davis.
- Mark Lawson** — Director of the UC President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program and Professor in Residence in the Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Sciences at the University of California, San Diego School of Medicine.
- Juan M. Madera** — Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Houston.
- Kara Nelson** — Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Associate Dean for Equity and Inclusion in the College of Engineering at the University of California, Berkeley.
- KerryAnn O’Meara** — Professor of Higher Education, Associate Dean in the College of Education, and Director of the ADVANCE Program at the University of Maryland, College Park.
- Victoria C. Plaut** — Professor of Law and Social Science at the University of California, Berkeley School of Law, Director of the Culture, Diversity, and Intergroup Relations Lab, and faculty affiliate in psychology.
- Lauren Rivera** — Professor at the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University.
- Denise Sekaquaptewa** — Professor and Associate Chair of the Department of Psychology, University of Michigan.
- Isis Settles** — Professor of Psychology, Afroamerican and African Studies, and Women’s Studies at the University of Michigan.
- Kimberlee Shauman** — Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Davis.
- Angelica Stacy** — Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty at the University of California, Berkeley.
- Abigail Stewart** — Sandra Schwartz Tangri Distinguished University Professor of Psychology and Women’s Studies at the University of Michigan.
- Sarah Thébaud** — Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Kecia M. Thomas** — Senior Associate Dean for the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences and Professor of Industrial/Organizational Psychology and African-American Studies at the University of Georgia.



Conference Introduction

Increasing Equity and Diversity in Faculty Recruitment As An Urgent And Necessary Institutional Goal

Susan Carlson, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs, UC Office of the President

Vice Provost Carlson welcomed the conference attendees and provided the framework and research context for the meeting. She stated that increasing equity and diversity in faculty recruitment and retention is a necessary and valued goal. She also identified multiple stakeholders — from legislators to students — who are “rightfully impatient” for significant and sustained improvements in faculty inclusion and diversity, and she highlighted the essential roles that data collection and research play in those efforts. She underscored the opportunity this conference provided for researchers, faculty, administrators, and staff to share the cutting-edge research that can inform impactful policy and practice.

Ralph Hexter, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, UC Davis

In his welcome to the conference attendees, Provost Hexter argued that increasing equity and diversity among university faculty is the key to truly inclusive, vibrant and innovative institutions of higher education. He underscored the importance of research for the development of policies and programs that promote faculty equity and inclusion, and he highlighted ongoing programs and recent initiatives at UC Davis: the Advancing Equity Hiring initiative that funded eight college-wide open faculty searches in which review of the applicants’ Contributions to Diversity Statements was prioritized; the Capital Resource Network, which provides multi-tier family relocation and partner employment assistance in the greater Sacramento area; the Partner Opportunity Program, which supports dual-career hiring within the university; the Strength Through Equity and Diversity (STEAD) faculty committee; and faculty workshops on reducing the impact of implicit and institutional bias in faculty recruitment. Provost Hexter closed by urging attendees to take what they learn from the conference back to their campuses.

Session 1: Evidence of Bias in Academia

A major issue concerning faculty equity and diversity is the role of bias. Panel members discussed the evidence of bias in academia, the different forms that bias takes, and the multiple ways in which bias impacts faculty hiring and subsequent career trajectories.

Gender Bias at Work and in the Academy: What is the Problem?

Sarah Thébaud, University of California, Santa Barbara

Dr. Thébaud introduced the primary forms and patterns of workplace gender bias that have been documented over decades of research. Building on an overview of the “cognitive shortcuts” our brains use to process information and how these “shortcuts” generate bias in evaluation and decision-making, Dr. Thébaud reviewed the research on how bias manifests at work and in the academy. She cited studies documenting the tendency to apply different criteria or to shift the standards used to assess the competence of men and women, to subject members of underrepresented groups to more intense scrutiny, and to evaluate those who violate gender and race/ethnic stereotypes and norms (such as those who combine work and motherhood) more negatively than those who conform to cultural expectations. Such bias is observed in the evaluation of CVs, the content of teaching evaluations, differential access to mentors, hiring decisions, and salary offers. Dr. Thébaud emphasized that the research shows that such biases are more likely to occur when evaluators are rushed or cognitively burdened, when valid performance information is lacking, and when the evaluation criteria are vague or ambiguous.

Dr. Thébaud highlighted the research-informed practices organizations can adopt to attenuate the impact of bias. These include using masked review when possible; developing specific, measurable, and substantively relevant criteria for evaluation before decision-making; designing evaluation practices that ensure transparency and accountability; and making sure individuals and committees have sufficient time to make equitable decisions.



Gender and the Reception of Scientific Excellence: Job Talks in Academic Engineering

Mary Blair-Loy, University of California, San Diego

Dr. Blair-Loy presented results from published and ongoing studies (in collaboration with Erin Cech, and with Jordan Packer, Olga Mayorova, and Pamela Cosman) of faculty behavior during the job talk, a consequential step in the faculty recruitment process. Her work identifies biases in job talk practices and interactions that may generate significant gender-disparate outcomes but that also imply clear remediating practices.

Dr. Blair-Loy situates the study of job talks in the body of research that examines the cultural schemas of merit and scientific excellence and how those schemas may embed and perpetuate bias in faculty recruitment and career development. The research shows that a belief among faculty in the power of substantive expertise and meritocratic ideals to produce objective assessments may actually increase and perpetuate bias because such beliefs limit awareness and critical evaluation of the content and impact of the schemas that frame our assessments. The dominant schemas equate excellence with male-stereotyped characteristics such as assertiveness, self-promotion, and competitiveness, rather than female-typed characteristics like deference, self-effacement, and a commitment to diligence and effort. Dr. Blair-Loy's studies examine how adherence to these schemas may generate disparities in how the presenters are treated and evaluated by faculty during their job talks.

Using a sample of 151 video-recorded job talks across four engineering departments spanning five years, Dr. Blair-Loy and her collaborators coded the content of the job talk introductions and the frequency, timing, type, and tone of 2,776 questions, comments, and interruptions that occurred during the job talks. The analysis documents consequential gender differences in job talk introductions. Compared with the introductions for male presenters, the introductions for women were less likely to be overtly positive and to mention their research awards and accomplishments and were more likely to include irrelevant and inappropriate information or anecdotes. The analysis also revealed that women were more likely than men to be interrupted by overlapping questions or comments (i.e., audience members started speaking over the presenter's speech) and were less likely to receive supportive questions/comments. The women presenters in their sample were 2.3 times as likely as the men to receive questions that were both negative and overlapping.

Dr. Blair-Loy concluded that the observed job talk disparities reflect the persistent under-recognition of scientific excellence among female scholars while also revealing the not-so-subtle mechanisms that reinforce and perpetuate that undervaluation. She highlighted several policy recommendations implied by the study findings — adopting a consistent structure and content for speaker introductions, formalizing the timing and process for audience questions during job talks — that have zero cost, are easy to adopt, and may create greater equity and inclusion in the faculty hiring process.

Epistemic Exclusion: A Form of Academic Gatekeeping of Faculty of Color

Isis Settles, University of Michigan, **NiCole Buchanan**, Michigan State University

Dr. Settles and Dr. Buchanan identify *epistemic exclusion* as a potential barrier to increasing the recruitment, retention, and advancement of underrepresented racial minority (URM) faculty in the academy. Dr. Settles and Dr. Buchanan (in published and ongoing work with Kristie Dotson, Paulette Granberry Russell, Michael O'Rourke, Martinique Jones, and Marisa Rinkus) propose that epistemic exclusion — the process (or set of processes) by which research is characterized as peripheral to disciplinary norms, delegitimized, and/or devalued — is a gatekeeping mechanism that limits the participation and success of URM scholars in faculty positions. Drawing on work that identifies a fundamental division in U.S. academia that distinguishes the center (which is theoretical/basic, quantitative, and biological as opposed to behavioral or cultural, and/or West-centric) and the margin (which includes interdisciplinary, applied, qualitative, behavioral or cultural, and/or East-centric), Dr. Settles and Dr. Buchanan argue that faculty hiring and promotion processes tend to privilege established disciplinary norms and to disadvantage faculty of color because their work is more likely to be defined or perceived as marginal.

Using data from interviews with 118 URM faculty at a Research I institution, Dr. Settles and Dr. Buchanan



show that epistemic exclusion operates through: (1) formal processes that classify types of scholarship and determine the criteria used to assess its significance; and (2) informal processes that convey to faculty of color that they and their scholarship lack legitimacy and are not highly valued by the institution and their colleagues. Their interviews revealed widespread experience of the selective application of standards for tenure and promotion, of being evaluated according to “quality” metrics (e.g., journal impact factors) that disadvantage interdisciplinary work, of inequitable access to research funding, and of being perceived as engaged in “me-search” that lacks objectivity and generalizability.

Dr. Settles and Dr. Buchanan emphasize that epistemic exclusion has consequences for institutions as well as for the careers of individual scholars. As a seemingly legitimate form of academic gatekeeping, it works against the diversification of the academy in multiple ways: reducing racial/ethnic and substantive diversity in hiring, generating disparities in rates of promotion and retention, limiting the presence of scholars engaged in new types of scholarship. Strategies for reducing the occurrence and impact of epistemic exclusion should focus on faculty recruitment and evaluation committees and aim to increase awareness of the biased beliefs, policies, and practices that generate it. Dr. Settles and Dr. Buchanan recommended resources, such as the Toolbox Dialogue Initiative at Michigan State University, that can be used to facilitate discussions among faculty about disciplinary norms and values, and to map out the topics, methods, and approaches at the center and margins of their disciplines. Such discussions may help to shift the valuation of work on the margins, to move beyond reflexive reliance on metrics such as journal impact factors, and to reduce defensiveness among faculty engaged in scholarship at the center of their disciplines. They also highlighted the importance of group- and network-based mentorship programs, such as the Launch Committee program used at the University of Michigan and the programs offered by the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity, as essential to the success of faculty from underrepresented groups and those engaged in interdisciplinary or other types of scholarship at the “margins,” “boundaries” and “cutting edge.”

Session 2: The Use of Diversity Statements in Institutional Profiles and Faculty Recruitment

Universities are using “diversity statements” – those asserting their own commitment to diversity and those containing job applicants’ descriptions of their contributions to diversity – as tools to enhance faculty diversity and inclusivity. Panel members examined how “diversity statements” are used in universities today and to what effect.

Race, Gender, and Engagement with Contributions to Diversity Statements in Faculty Recruitment

Kimberlee Shauman, University of California, Davis

Dr. Shauman presented analyses of “Contribution to Diversity” (C2D) statements in faculty hiring in the UC system. The analysis of C2Ds is part of a larger project – *Evaluating Equity in Faculty Recruitment* (EEFR) – for which this conference served as a capstone. C2D statements, which are used with increasing frequency in faculty recruitment, are formal statements submitted by applicants describing their past experiences with, and/or potential contributions to, diversity through teaching, research, service, and other professional activities.

Using multiple years of EEFR data and a large corpus of C2Ds, Shauman and colleagues analyzed how recruitment-level engagement with C2D statements has varied over time (2013-2017) and by academic field. Their findings demonstrate a substantial increase in recruitment-level engagement with C2Ds, with only 11% of UC recruitments requiring them and 8% making them optional in 2013-2014 versus 66% requiring them and 28% making them optional in 2016-2017. Fields varied in their inclusion of C2Ds as optional or required components of an application. For example, in 2016-17, biological sciences and physical sciences were more likely to require C2Ds, whereas humanities were more likely to make them optional.

Dr. Shauman also presented analyses of variation in engagement with C2D statements by applicant gender and race/ethnicity. With regard to submission, for example, when C2Ds were optional, women were more



likely than men to submit them and Asian/Asian-American and URM applicants were more likely than white applicants to submit them. With regard to content, C2Ds from women tended to be longer and more likely to mention equity and social justice compared with C2Ds submitted by men. Men's C2Ds were more likely than women's to include "I will" statements, indicating how they *intend* to engage with issues of diversity, whereas women's C2Ds were more likely than men's to include "I have been" statements, indicating how they have already engaged with diversity issues. URM applicants were more likely than Asian/Asian-Americans and whites to mention social justice. Whites were more likely to engage with gender equity in their C2Ds, and URM applicants were more likely to report committee service.

Dr. Shauman concluded that requiring C2Ds is the most equitable and appropriate approach to their use in faculty hiring. When C2Ds are an optional component in the application materials, their submission will be inconsistent. In such circumstances, C2D submission may be used to identify applicants who are truly engaged with issues related to equity and inclusion, but treating C2Ds as an optional part of the application also results in situations where information cannot be compared equitably across all candidates and where, therefore, the submission of C2Ds and their content may be downplayed or disregarded. Requiring all applicants to submit C2Ds, coupled with clearly articulated goals for their use and guidance for recruitment committee members on how to evaluate them, will maximize the utility of C2Ds in faculty hiring.

Integrating contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion into faculty searches in the College of Engineering at UC Berkeley

Kara Nelson, University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Nelson, Associate Dean for Equity and Inclusion in the College of Engineering (CoE) at UC Berkeley, presented on the adoption of C2D statements in faculty hiring. The CoE is one of the largest units on campus, housing seven departments and nearly 220 faculty, and has a centralized dean position for Equity and Inclusion, signaling the importance of this issue for the College. In 2017, the CoE received a University of California Office of the President (UCOP) Advancing Faculty Diversity Grant to improve the faculty search process to overcome barriers faced by female and URM applicants and to cultivate a culture in which all community members view themselves as active participants in advancing equity and inclusion. To do this, the CoE formally integrated an assessment of faculty applicants' contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) into the search process and elevated the importance of excellence on this criterion to that of research and teaching.

Dr. Nelson discussed how the CoE has integrated this focus on applicants' contributions to DEI throughout the faculty search process, including the job announcement, the diversity statement, the interview process, the evaluation rubric, and support for new faculty hires. First, through language in the job announcement, the CoE signaled a serious commitment to DEI and expectations that applicants would share that commitment. The CoE also provided resources for applicants describing how assessments of commitment to DEI are made and how applicants can concretely demonstrate their contributions to advancing DEI. To give all applicants equal access, these resources were made publicly available through UC Berkeley's Office of Faculty Equity and Welfare (OFEW) website. Furthermore, the interview invitation letter put candidates on notice that they would need to concretely engage with DEI issues and demonstrate commitments and activities in their area. Thus, candidates who could not concretely speak to their contributions to DEI during the interview were more readily exposed.

The CoE also provided guidance and resources for search committees on best practices for evaluating faculty. These include using DEI rubrics that establish minimum thresholds before reviewing applications. Additionally, the CoE required search committees to use candidates' diversity statements as a core metric of evaluation, with committee members having to publicly explain their choices. Once again, diversity statements had to demonstrate how faculty have already advanced DEI, not just their intent to do so once hired. The CoE also followed through on its efforts in the hiring process by supporting newly hired faculty. This included providing significant funding to newly hired faculty to support their professional development and DEI activities. Dr. Nelson also described how skepticism among existing faculty can be reduced through clearly articulated and data-supported messages about how candidates who are invested in advancing DEI are likely to be highly effective researchers, teachers, and departmental citizens.



Promises and Pitfalls of Diversity Statements

Eve Fine, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Dr. Fine presented a review of research on institutional statements of commitment to diversity, based on a published article (with collaborators Molly Carnes and Jennifer Sheridan). Dr. Fine suggested that as we consider expanding reliance on “diversity statements” in reviewing faculty applicants, we may learn from existing research on institutional diversity statements.

According to Dr. Fine, institutional diversity statements can attract diverse groups of people, establish a basis for developing policies that promote a welcoming environment, and provide a rationale for considering applicants’ ability to foster diversity or work with diverse populations. Not all diversity statements are effective, however. For instance, *declarative* statements that an institution values diversity (e.g., “we don’t discriminate,” “we are proud to be diverse and inclusive”) may engender distrust because they falsely insinuate that the institution has achieved diversity, equity, and inclusion. *Aspirational* statements are better, because they show an institution’s willingness to work hard but leave room for the fact that the goal has not been fully achieved (e.g., “we strive to create a diverse and welcoming environment”).

Controlling statements, institutional statements that highlight external barriers to being prejudiced (e.g., “It is socially unacceptable to discriminate”, “The [University name] must seek to achieve diversity”), might increase resistance to the goal. *Autonomous* statements (e.g., valuing diversity because it is a value and not because of societal/legal pressures) may be better received. Additionally, *colorblind* diversity messages, emphasizing sameness, may not be as effective as *multicultural* statements, which place an emphasis on valuing and respecting differences. Multicultural diversity statements, however, are not a panacea – especially if they are not accompanied by actions.

Dr. Fine ended by asking audience members to consider the implications of diversity statements for the search process. Search committees and departments should be cognizant of how their statements about diversity can reduce or increase anxiety and trust among applicants. Additionally, search committees should be prepared to evaluate applicants’ diversity statements by paying attention to the type of statements applicants employed (e.g., controlling, declarative, autonomous, colorblind). Finally, Dr. Fine cautioned that requiring diversity statements may act as a moral credential for institutions that can limit their effectiveness if not engaged with conscientiously.

Lunch & Keynote Address:

Creating an Inclusive Institution: Recruiting and Retaining the Faculty We Need

Abigail Stewart, Sandra Schwartz Tangri Distinguished University Professor of Psychology and Women’s Studies, University of Michigan

Dr. Stewart presented insights detailed in her book *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence* (co-authored with Virginia Valian, MIT Press, 2018). She began by highlighting the importance of increasing diversity, equity, and inclusion among faculty and noted that the University of California is setting the bar for institutions across the country through its use of data to guide action and maintain focus on that goal. Dr. Stewart noted that many academic institutions strive to achieve valued social goals, such as the search for truth, respect for knowledge and expertise, promoting creativity and innovation, commitment to merit, and increasing access and inclusion in higher education. Although universities often do a good job realizing the first few, most academic institutions struggle with the last two: to judge merit accurately and to reduce the prevalence of exclusionary practices.

Dr. Stewart proposed that fair judgments of merit are a fundamental precondition of access to and inclusion in educational institutions. Thus, before we can achieve equal access and inclusion, we must rethink our definitions of merit. The academy requires many judgments of merit, informal and formal, but judging merit accurately is complicated. It requires people to forecast success, and such forecasting can fall prey to the fundamental attribution error, or the tendency to attribute success and failure to the person rather than to the situation. Judgments of merit also can be influenced by group-based schemas and implicit biases. Dr. Stewart discussed numerous barriers to access in faculty recruitment processes that have been documented by empirical research. For example, studies showing that only 9 to 14 percent of faculty obtain positions at



institutions more prestigious than their doctoral-granting institution suggest that universities rely on institutional affiliations as a proxy for excellence rather than evaluating quality directly. Scholars' network connections, which are largely homogenous by race and gender, have been shown to influence faculty recruitment as well as peer review processes for publication, fellowship, and grant selection that are consequential for individual career success.

Dr. Stewart discussed how overconfidence in our competence as decision-makers can lead to bad judgments. She cited research demonstrating that the predictions by expert political pundits have a worse-than-chance accuracy rate, yet experts resist admitting to their errors. Dr. Stewart argued that one explanation for the inaccuracy of experts is that they tend to rely on fast intuition more than slow, deliberate processes and have high confidence in the quality of their judgments. But studies show that intuition ("fast thinking") is reliable in regular and predictable environments with opportunities for quick and frequent feedback, and decision-making in the academy, especially for faculty hiring processes, seldom occurs in such conditions.

Judgments can be improved, however, and Dr. Stewart discussed some key practices and processes that increase equity and effectiveness in evaluation and decision-making. The common goal of these practices is to design contexts and situational constraints that encourage evaluators and decision-makers to focus on and methodically evaluate merit. Effective practices include: openly discussing and establishing a priori, detailed and observable criteria that will be used to judge merit; identifying and using specific evidence to assess each criterion; identifying and actively questioning the value of proxies such as intuitional or network affiliations, and avoiding global judgments; providing sufficient time to conduct thorough evaluations, to discuss the evaluations among committee members; and building in explicit process for feedback (e.g., collecting data on outcomes of applicants interviewed but not hired) and correcting evaluative errors.

Dr. Stewart discussed several strategies that have been particularly effective for improving access and inclusion of URM and female scholars in academia. These include: developing and disseminating complete information about academic jobs and the faculty hiring process to potential and actual applicants; institutionalizing multiple opportunities for applicants to display and discuss their expertise; removing, reducing or actively counteracting ambient cues of exclusion (e.g., who is featured on the department website or pictured in the conference room; is information about work-life balance actively shared?); and educating decision-makers about the importance of adopting practices that facilitate equitable evaluation.

Dr. Stewart concluded by stating that there is no silver bullet for ensuring equity in the professoriate. Instead, she encouraged audience members to embrace multiple research-informed approaches. These approaches should encompass programs that target recruitment, retention and promotion (e.g., extensive onboarding and launch committees for faculty mentorship), and climate (e.g., norm creation, re-acclimation through interactive theater programs, and network- and community-building activities). Finally, Dr. Stewart discussed how institutions can make changes stick by making systematic the collection and analysis of institutional data, assessing programs as they are implemented, and institutionalizing programs, policies, and practices that work.

Session 3: Translating Research to Policy and Practice — What works?

"Best practices" to diversify faculty recruitments are rarely empirically assessed. This session features innovative research that examines which search methods and institutional approaches really work.

Recruiting and Retaining Women and Minority Faculty: Programs that Help, Programs that Hurt

Frank Dobbin, Harvard University

Using data gathered from 600 universities across the United States, Dr. Dobbin and his colleagues (Alexandra Kalev, Gal Deutsch, Leroy Gonsalves, Kwan Woo Kim) have analyzed the impact of key diversity programs on faculty diversity, gender, and race-ethnicity over the past quarter-century. Their findings suggest the following four approaches are most effective: (1) Put the faculty in charge (e.g., create diversity taskforces, engage in targeted recruitment); (2) Give the faculty protégés (e.g., mentoring programs); (3)



Make the faculty accountable (e.g., establish diversity managers and practice review); (4) Commit to work-life balance (e.g., develop practices that help partners and parents).

More specifically, Dr. Dobbin presented data showing gender and race/ethnicity taskforces bolstered representation of marginalized groups — particularly women of color. Targeted recruitment programs increased representation for some faculty of color and white women. Mentoring programs that provide faculty with protégés are quite effective, along with departmental and university mentoring programs for minorities and faculty affinity groups, which showed increases in the representation of some faculty of color and white women. Black women did not seem to benefit from university mentor programs, however. Accountability in the form of instituting reviews of the applicant pool, time-in-rank, and start-up packages *before* finalizing decisions benefited many groups, though white women did not seem to benefit from reviews of start-up packages. Programs facilitating work-life balance were effective at increasing the representation of women from all racial backgrounds. Such programs include establishing a work-life office, partner job-search assistance, and part-time tenure path. Dr. Dobbin noted that dual-career job search assistance, like those offered through Higher Education Recruitment Consortia (HERCs), was most helpful for junior female faculty. Many of these effective practices show low usage rates, however.

Dr. Dobbin and his colleagues' work allows for intersectional analysis, gender*race-ethnicity, of program efficacy (i.e., assessing the impact of specific diversity programs on black women, black men, white women, etc.). Although Dr. Dobbin asserted that more analysis is needed to disentangle why certain programs did not seem to benefit certain groups, he noted that many programmatic approaches to diversity are effective. In regard to negative findings for particular groups (e.g., women of color), he noted that a careful analysis of which institutions are causing negative numbers is necessary before concluding that a program doesn't work for a specific group.

An Evidence-based Faculty Recruitment Workshop Influences Hiring Perceptions Among University Faculty

Denise Sekaquaptewa, University of Michigan

As a member of the University of Michigan's Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence (STRIDE) committee, Dr. Sekaquaptewa provided information and advice about practices that will increase the likelihood that diverse, well-qualified faculty candidates are identified, selected for offers, recruited, retained, and promoted. The STRIDE committee hosts faculty recruitment workshops that detail social science research on how race and gender bias influence hiring decisions and features strategies to mitigate bias. Dr. Sekaquaptewa and colleagues (Koji Takahashi, Janet Malley, Keith Herzog, and Sara Bliss) have tested the impact of these faculty recruitment workshops (FRW) on faculty attitudes toward evidence-based, equitable hiring practices, specifically what causes attitude changes and whether high attendance at FRW among one's colleagues can influence non-attendees. Based on two studies over five years, they found that faculty who attended an FRW experienced an increase in the endorsement of equitable search strategies, a greater intention to behave consistently with equitable practices, and an increased likelihood of speaking up if someone violated an equitable search strategy. The endorsement of equitable search strategies was greater among faculty members when a greater proportion of their academic department colleagues attended an FRW, and even among respondents who had not attended an FRW themselves. Furthermore, the percentage of faculty in the department who attended a workshop was a positive predictor of an individual's perception of departmental practices, even among those who had not attended an FRW themselves, suggesting a group influence and a normalization of the process had occurred.

Finally, there was suggestive evidence that having recently attended an FRW increased endorsement of equitable search practices because faculty, especially men who are less likely to have directly experienced bias, found the social science research presented in the FRW to be persuasive. Hence, these studies provide evidence that STRIDE's approach to faculty recruitment leads to increased support of equitable search practices and intention to enact these practices among FRW attendees and their faculty colleagues, whether or not they, too, attended an FRW.



Searching for a Diverse Faculty: Data-Driven Recommendations

Angelica Stacy, Marc Goulden, Karie Frasch, and Janet Broughton, University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Stacy and colleagues at UC Berkeley surveyed all faculty search committee chairs from 2012 to 2015 to assess the value of search practices commonly thought to be effective in diversifying faculty hires. The 55-item survey was completed by 220 search chairs and contained responses to questions in five categories: (1) position specification, (2) active recruitment strategies, (3) practices intended to reduce implicit bias, (4) activities highlighting department commitment to diversity, and (5) practices assessing campus-specific mechanisms.

Searches using some practices showed increased proportions of women and underrepresented minority (URM) individuals at various search stages in comparison with searches that did not use the practice. Some of the most promising practices included describing the search area in a way that was likely to tap especially rich applicant pools of women and URMs (e.g., signaling that they are interested in applicants who do public/translational scholarship); mentioning diversity issues in the description (e.g., used “labor and women’s history” versus “labor history”); conducting intensive outreach; departmental discussion of diversity priorities in relation to other priorities; and appointment of women and URM faculty to search committees.

The researchers also reported that some widely recommended practices did not have a positive statistical association with diversity at various search stages, or were even negatively associated with diversity. Practices that were not clearly promising included using comparative data (e.g., compared relative success to peer institutions regarding diversity issues/hiring); using weighted rubrics for assessing applications; encouraging implicit-bias training for committee members; and creating job criteria that included evidence of commitment to diversity (e.g., diversity statements). One caveat was that the data cannot speak to *how* things like implicit-bias training and diversity statements are defined and used, and there may be instances where they could be effective. Some recent work within the UC system where diversity statements are used in a highly intensive fashion show promise. Additionally, some practices showed promise for increasing URM proportions but not proportions of women across the board. The research team also noted that certain survey items may have been too generic (e.g., “advertised widely”) and the lack of specification may have led to inconclusive results. They also observed that even if demographic numbers do not move, some interventions might be deemed effective for other reasons.

The full report can be found at:

https://ofew.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/searching_for_a_diverse_faculty- data-driven_recommendations.pdf

Nudging Toward Diversity: Applying Behavioral Design to Faculty Hiring

KerryAnn O’Meara, University of Maryland, Director of ADVANCE project.

Dr. O’Meara and colleagues (Dawn Culpepper and Lindsey Templeton) examined research on faculty hiring through the lens of behavioral economics and social psychology, focusing on both fast (System 1, intuitive and automatic) and slow (System 2, conscious and deliberate) modes of thinking. System 1 thinking defaults to *pipeline myths* that there are simply not enough candidates and results in *cloning networks* in which decision-makers seek out others like themselves, *anchoring* heavily on limited information and *confirmation biases*. This approach advantages white and male candidates and disadvantages white women and URM candidates through four key phases of the faculty hiring process: (1) framing the position and search committee composition; (2) marketing, outreach and recruitment; (3) evaluating candidates; and (4) shortlists, interviews, and final hiring decisions.

Dr. O’Meara suggests using nudges to disrupt (bias-prone) System 1 processes during faculty hiring. Because job descriptions (Phase 1) tend to clone prior faculty and place one individual on the committee in charge of inclusive hiring, a nudge could make job descriptions cast a wider net and have the entire committee trained in equitable hiring practices. During recruitment efforts (Phase 2), a nudge could require using data to determine applicant benchmarks and not relying on assumptions about who is “gettable.” Phase 3 should minimize reliance on “fit” and networks of prestige, focusing on “decision-support tools”



such as rubrics and pre-determined criteria. Phase 4 should minimize unscripted interactions and tokenism and include qualitative assessments, turning back shortlists that are not diverse enough.

Dr. O'Meara also discussed a hands-on two-year pilot program (2016-2018) with more than 75 faculty search committees at the University of Maryland that reviewed and implemented evidence-based inclusive hiring practices. Most promising practices included: hiring workshops for search committee members, marketing and outreach to diverse networks, search committee review of data on candidate pools, using criteria-based assessments of candidates, accountability enforced by hiring officials, and using threshold lists as opposed to ranking candidates. Although there were limitations in reporting outcomes and only marginal increases in URM faculty representation, evidence-based interventions are still important even if dissonance arises between research and practice.

Session 4: Panel Discussion: How to Institutionalize Research-Based Policy and Practice

This session featured how research informs program design and outcomes. Vice Provost Susan Carlson introduced this final panel, noting that the conference organizers intentionally concluded with a focus on institutionalizing interventions and practices. She reminded participants that although the University of California has generated many important innovations, there is much to learn from efforts at other institutions. All of the Session 4 presenters were veteran university administrators who drew on their considerable experience in building and administering programs aimed at advancing faculty diversity. Presenters discussed research-based program design, as well as their experiences with acceptance of and resistance to such efforts.

Using Data to Change the Conversation on Diversity in Hiring

Mark Lawson, University of California, President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program

Dr. Lawson is a faculty member at the school of medicine at UC San Diego and a beneficiary of an innovative UC equity hiring practice, the UC President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP). As the current director of the PPFP, Dr. Lawson discussed the history of the program and presented data about how PPFP increases faculty representation of URM and women across the UC system and its partner affiliates. The PPFP was founded in 1984 with the express mission of supporting underrepresented groups in higher education. In 1996, the program adapted to comply with new legal requirements imposed by Proposition 209. The PPFP offers two years of support to postdoctoral fellows, including research, travel, and conference funds. Additionally, fellows participating in writing workshops, receive protected research time and support in hiring negotiations.

In addition to fellowship support, the PPFP created incentives for the UC campuses to hire its outstanding scholars. In 2003, the Faculty Hiring Incentive Program began providing five years of partial salary support to UC campuses that hire current and former UC President's and Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellows for faculty appointments. In 2017, the PPFP expanded the hiring incentive to include the professional schools and the health sciences. A campus receives \$85,000 per year for five years (total \$425,000) for each PPFP/CPF hired into a Ladder-Rank Equivalent position. These funds go to the campus and are not tied to FTE or salary support. President Napolitano has committed an additional \$2 million in permanent funding to the program, which supports additional fellowships, staff, and increased conference and travel costs.

Over the past 10 years, application rates for the program have more than doubled; and since 2003, UC campuses have hired 215 fellows into tenure-track positions. Dr. Lawson presented data to disrupt common myths that undermine faculty diversity efforts. For instance, a common claim is that there are not qualified candidates from the PPFP program that match search criteria, but the PPFP data indicates that Berkeley, Los Angeles, Davis, Irvine, and San Diego are among the top 20 producers of Ph.Ds in most disciplines. Another common point of resistance is that diversity comes at the expense of excellence, but the data presented by Dr. Lawson suggest the contrary is true. Nearly 80 percent of PPFP fellows on the UC faculty receive tenure, and PPFP fellows reach tenure at a higher rate than non-PPFP hires. Dr. Lawson concluded by highlighting how institutionalized programs like PPFP can have large effects on faculty equity and representation in higher education.



UCI Inclusive Excellence Career Eco-System: A Pilot Program

Douglas Haynes, University of California, Irvine

Dr. Haynes, Vice Provost for Academic Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, reported on the effects of a pilot project at the University of California, Irvine, *Advancing Faculty Diversity: Inclusive Excellence Career Eco-System*. Funded by the UC Advancing Faculty Diversity Initiative, this program built on a successful hiring program in 2017-2018 that resulted in eight UC president's and chancellor's postdoctoral fellows being appointed into the biological sciences, engineering, and information and computer science. The purpose of the UCI Inclusive Excellence Career Eco-System is to advance career success for early-career researchers in STEM fields at two important milestones: recruitment and mid-career.

The program's goal is to reduce uncertainty and increase a sense of equity at a critical career stage by making the faculty member's home institution more legible and resources more available. The pilot program structures career support and resources through a concierge model and consists of three integrated components. The first component assigns equity advisors to serve as trusted resources at the beginning of the recruitment processes and beyond. In this role, advisors reach out to new hires and help them set up necessary career and personal resources. The second component improves equity by directly investing in career resources as part of the hire's institutional start-up package rather than making those resources subject to negotiation. The start-up component seeks to minimize the adversarial negotiating posture that the job process often produces. Further, this strategy includes incentivizing recruitment by offering FTE matching funds and a sizable grant of supplemental research funding to each hire. The third component involves broadening recruitment by leveraging the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program pool. Finally, the pilot project organized and supported mentoring teams explicitly charged with working with assistant professors to develop a three-year plan and strategy for a positive mid-career appraisal.

Dr. Haynes reports that after the introduction of the pilot program, ladder-rank URM hires increased nearly sixfold. After the pilot, UCI had 40.9% URMs among its ladder-rank new hires, compared with only 6% URMs among the ladder-rank hires of a comparable UC institution not using the intervention. Although the number of women increased among UCI's ladder-rank new hires, those increases were not as dramatic as the increases in URM hires.

Dr. Haynes concluded by proposing a model for institutional change in STEM faculty retention. The model proposes that deans, equity advisors, graduate students, faculty mentors, and UCI resources all play roles in creating the activities (e.g., career concierge models, faculty career team awards) that lead to outputs like visible leadership support of equity practices, elimination of promotion and tenure inequities, and increases in overall institutional productivity and culture. This model helps create an ecosystem where URMs and women can thrive.

Developing a Climate for Diversity and Inclusion: Starting from Scratch

Kecia M. Thomas, University of Georgia.

Dr. Thomas, Senior Associate Dean for the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Georgia, discussed the launch of a new college-level Office for Inclusion and Diversity Leadership and efforts to build an institutional climate for diversity and inclusion. Dr. Thomas shared the strategies undertaken at the University of Georgia that incorporate best practices from industrial/organizational psychology. She also addressed the challenges of building a diversity office and diversity strategy from "the middle" and branching out, as well as mechanisms for circumventing diversity resistance.

The Office for Inclusion and Diversity Leadership was established in 2007 in collaboration with the dean and a task force of faculty and staff. Its priorities included recruiting and retaining faculty and graduate students, building pipelines of diverse leadership, and supporting cultural competency throughout the institution. To achieve those priorities, the task force engaged several major paradigms in organizational diversity to frame its approach. Dr. Thomas reports that some paradigms were more effective than others. For instance, the *Discrimination & Fairness* paradigm measures diversity by how well the institution achieves its recruitment and retention goals rather than by the degree to which conditions in the institution allow people feel empowered and safe enough to do their work effectively. The *Access & Legitimacy*



paradigm, which seeks access to and legitimacy with diverse groups, celebrates difference but often runs the risk of segregating people into niche spaces. This outcome may have detrimental effects on diversity because people may feel exploited, and when they leave the institution, they take their specialized knowledge (and resentment) with them. The *Learning & Effectiveness* paradigm promotes equal opportunity for all individuals like the fairness paradigm and acknowledges cultural differences like the access paradigm. However, the learning and effectiveness paradigm views diversity as an opportunity to integrate (as opposed to assimilate or exploit) diversity into the mainstream of the institution.

Dr. Thomas implored the audience to think about recruitment as a year-round endeavor and as a marketing signal to applicants about what matters to the institution. Recruitment, she explained, can be administrative, evaluative, and/or culturally reinforcing. Administrative recruitment efforts include developing diverse search committees, conducting implicit-bias training with committees, job ad placement, and engaging diverse networks. Evaluative recruitment refers to all the interactions that happen with the job candidate once they are on campus (e.g., interviews). In developing the Office for Inclusion and Diversity Leadership, Dr. Thomas emphasized that institutions should be intentional with every interaction, understanding that even the car ride over to dinner with applicants is a space where equity and inclusion should be at play. Finally, cultural-reinforcing recruitment efforts help to develop norms around equity and inclusion, including the integration of equity and inclusion expectations in offer letters, annual reviews of department heads, and graduate programming, as well as rewards and recognition for service and a commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Dr. Thomas concluded by providing information on best practices and the programs and initiatives the Offices for Inclusion and Diversity Leadership has undertaken. She also provided access to a Faculty Recruitment Toolkit, a resource guide for engaging equitable recruitment practices, which can be accessed at <https://www.franklin.uga.edu/resources>. One final strategy Dr. Thomas recommended is the creation of mechanisms for sharing success stories of practices that work well. Sharing positive and promising efforts is important for maintaining momentum.

Take-Aways: What have we learned? What topics need investigation?

Vice Provost Carlson concluded the conference by thanking the panelists and the audience and providing several takeaways with which to frame the insights from the day. First, she discussed the urgent need to rethink merit. As discussed by the keynote speaker, Dr. Stewart, merit often acts as a barrier to inclusion for faculty given that decision-makers rarely judge merit without bias. Vice Provost Carlson also stated that leadership matters if diversity, equity, and inclusion in faculty hiring and recruitment are to be achieved. She acknowledged the leadership of many deans, hiring officials, and administrators in the room. Leadership, she noted, needs to be distributed among department chairs, staff, and researchers alike. This distribution of leadership, expertise, and power bolsters efforts to get the work done. Finally, Vice Provost Carlson pointed out that research is essential to all future endeavors in this area. What we consider valuable research, however, should be conceptualized more expansively so that we do not reproduce the very systems of exclusion we are trying to abolish.

