Committee Chair Survey

Your Faculty Search and "Best Practices" to Diversify Faculty Applicant Pools and Hires

As a Federal contractor, UC is required to take affirmative action to ensure that all individuals have an equal opportunity for employment, without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, citizenship, sex, age, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability, or status as a disabled veteran or Vietnam-era veteran, or other protected veterans. In meeting this obligation, the University analyzes candidate pools and compares our candidates and appointees with our underlying labor-pool availability.

The current academic literature recommends many "best practices," identifying them as effective in diversifying faculty applicant pools and hires. Our review of this literature, however, suggests that few of these practices have been carefully studied. In addition, their applicability at your campus is unclear.

We are carrying out a more rigorous investigation of the value of widely recommended practices, and seek your help in conducting this study. We will use responses to this survey to examine whether any practices recently employed within the UC system are correlated with diverse faculty pools and hires. We also aim to identify untested "best practices" that might be useful in future job searches. Our analytical focus is not on your individual job search; rather, we are seeking to examine the efficacy of hiring methods employed across a large number of UC faculty job searches.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to respond candidly to this survey module. Once we have enough data to produce meaningful results, we will share them with you.

Section 1. Specification of the Faculty Position and Desired Qualifications

Academic literature and various national and local datasets demonstrate that gender, race, and ethnicity vary substantially among degree recipients and faculty applicants by disciplines and sub-disciplines (also by cohort). Furthermore, the diversity of faculty hires is associated with the diversity of faculty applicant pools. Hence, hiring committees can unintentionally reduce the diversity of applicant pools, interviewees, and hires by specifying qualifications in narrow ways; or they can increase diversity through broader specification, or carefully calibrated specification in sub-topical or multi-topical areas. The below set of "best practices," referenced in the academic literature or suggested by other research universities, encourages crafting faculty positions, qualifications, and the approach to evaluating potential candidates in ways that are believed to maximize the diversity of candidate pools and eventual faculty hires.

In the current job search under discussion, which of the following "best practices" did you or members of your committee or department use in an effort to diversify the faculty applicant pool/hire(s)?

Whether you employed the practice or not, we would be very interested in any comments you might have about the proposed practice in regard to actual/possible utility, and whether you think it might be a feasible approach to diversify faculty applicant pools and hires in your department(s).

			Use				
	Job description/specification	Used	Partially used 3	Did not use	Not applicable	Not sure/ Other	Comments
а	Specified the position in a disciplinary area with relatively high diversity of degree recipients/faculty (based on examination of demographic data or personal observation).	0	0	0	0	0	
b	Coupled the subject area with diversity issues (e.g., "labor and/or women's history" vs. just "labor history").	0	0	0	0	0	
С	Selected subject area(s) associated with "public" or "engaged scholarship"fields focused on direct societal improvement, particularly in regard to underserved communities/populations (e.g., studying health disparities by gender, race, and ethnicity, with a focus on policy).	0	0	0	0	0	L.
d	Prioritized recently established disciplinary growth areas or areas of new departmental need rather than looking to replace a retiring faculty member.	0	0	0	0	0	
е	Conducted this search as one position among several that have been authorized by the campus across multiple units in a research area likely to have diverse applicant pools (e.g., a cluster hire of several positions in Native American studies).	0	0	0	0	0	

			Use	ed the pra	ctice?		
	Job qualifications/evaluation process		Partially used ②	Did not use	Not applicable	Not sure/ Other	Comments
f	Actively sought candidates with degrees from a broad range of different institutional settings/types (e.g., PhDs from non-top-tier programs; or degrees from historically black or Hispanic-serving colleges/universities).	0	0	0	0	0	
g	Actively considered candidates with publications from less well-known journals/publishers, carefully evaluating the quality of the work, rather than assessing importance based on placement.	0	0	0	0	0	
h	Specified in the job ads, qualifications <u>and</u> evaluation criteria that demonstrated commitment to diversity, experience with multicultural education, working with diverse populations, or similar undertaking is desirable.	0	0	0	0	0	
i	Gave statements from candidates on their contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion significant weight in the evaluation and selection process (e.g., with two candidates similarly above the bar in research, selected the one stronger in contributions to diversity).	0	0	0	0	0	

Section 2. Active Recruitment of Faculty Candidates

Research studies, national policy briefs, and faculty search handbooks at other major research universities consistently draw two major observations regarding faculty availability pools of women and underrepresented minorities (URM), particularly in regard to some of the less tractable disciplines in the sciences: (1) there is a supply problem in a good number of fields where women, and even more noticeably URM, comprise a small proportion of doctorate degree recipients; (2) a substantial proportion of women and URM in these fields, and other fields, report not being actively recruited by major research universities. Given both this "pool problem" and this possible "failure to recruit," the recommended "best practices" suggest that institutions that take active approaches to recruiting women and URM are much more likely to diversify faculty applicant pools and hires than other competitor institutions.

Which of the following "best practices" did you or members of your committee or department use in an effort to diversify the faculty applicant pools/finalists for this position (and to ensure that first-choice faculty candidates accepted your job offer)?

Please share with us any comments you might have.

	Recruitment activities undertaken during the <i>recruitment phase</i> of <u>this</u> job search	Used	Partially used @	Did not use	Not applicable	Not sure/ Other	Comments
а	Advertised in diversity specific venues in your field (e.g., National Society of Hispanic Physicists).	0	0	0	0	0	
b	Personally contacted colleagues from other institutions to ask for their help in identifying potential applicants from diverse backgrounds.	0	0	0	0	0	
С	Directly called/emailed possible candidates with diverse backgrounds and encouraged them to apply to the position.	0	0	0	0	0	
d	Put out a call to the larger department (faculty and graduate students), other departments, and other possible campus resources (e.g., campus committees focused on diversity) to help the hiring committee identify potential faculty applicants of diverse backgrounds.	0	0	0	0	0	
е	Made use of programs/events that bring possible future faculty candidates from diverse backgrounds to your campus and department on a short- or longer-term basis (e.g., visiting scholar/postdoctoral programs, promising-scholar lecture series, hosting conferences of high interest to diverse populations, etc.).	0	0	0	0	0	
f	Tapped existing UC academic pipelines to diversify the applicant search pool (e.g., considered current or former students from diverse backgrounds or UC President's Postdoctoral Fellowship recipients (http://www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel/ppfp/uc_ppfp.html))	0	0	0	0	0	

			Us	ed the pra	ctice?		
	Recruitment activities undertaken during the <i>interview and offer</i> of <u>this</u> job search		Partially used ?	Did not use	Not applicable	Not sure/ Other	Comments
g	Arranged to have finalists meet with campus groups/individuals from diverse backgrounds.	0	0	0	0	0	
h	Notified candidates about possible dual-career couple employment options and family friendly policies/resources.	0	0	0	0	0	4

Section 3. Minimizing the Impact of Unconscious Bias

A number of recent studies have suggested that implicit associations are common among the general population in regard to issues of gender, race/ethnicity, and expectations regarding the likelihood of long-term professional success/achievement (e.g., "boys are better at math and science"). These patterns are observed among both majority and minority populations, including highly educated individuals, men and women, and can be demonstrated with the aid of carefully designed experiments (e.g., click here (https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/demo/) for one example). In response to these findings, many scholars and practitioners assert the importance of structuring search committees and search processes in ways that minimize these possible associations; and the need to train committee members to be aware of implicit bias, so as to mitigate its impact on assessments and deliberations.

Which of the following "best practices" did you or members of your committee or department use in an effort to minimize the possible impact of "implicit associations" on evaluating faculty candidates?

Please share with us any comments you might have. Again, we greatly appreciate candid responses as these will help us to better assess what future actions/recommendations might be viable and desirable.

			Use	ed the prac	ctice?		
	Practices to minimize the possible impact of implicit associations throughout the entire search process	Used	Partially used ②	Did not use	Not applicable	Not sure/ Other	Comments
а	Committee members attended workshops regarding implicit bias <u>and</u> followed specific recommendations for reducing the impact of bias in the selection process.	0	0	0	0	0	10
b	In evaluating each candidate, used a weighted scoring rubric incorporating all selection criteria (e.g., using a consistent numerical score or scaled words such as excellent, good, fair, poor, for each selection criterion).	0	0	0	0	0	lo de
С	To reduce the impact of possible bias in letters of recommendation, evaluated all of the candidate's materials prior to considering the letters.	0	0	0	0	0	le de
d	Made sure all applications were reviewed by at least two reviewers.	0	0	0	0	0	le
е	Appointed senior reviewers or equity advisors to monitor the equity of all recruitment related processes/decisions.	0	0	0	0	0	

Section 4. Prioritizing and Institutionalizing a Commitment to Diversity

Most recent scholarship related to equity issues in academia emphasizes the importance of institutionalizing a commitment to diversity and equity at all levels of an organization, from the highest administrative offices to the local unit. This commitment often begins with an enhanced appreciation for the importance of diversity in the local unit (typically departments), the establishment of realistic goals, the identification of mechanisms that can be used to promote the desired outcomes, and benchmarks to measure progress toward these goals. Furthermore, the literature asserts the need to hold institutions and individuals accountable for their relative success in establishing and realizing positive diversity-related outcomes.

Which of the following "best practices" did your committee and/or the department undertake in an effort to prioritize and institutionalize diversity-related concerns?

Please share with us any comments you might have.

		Use				
Practices that institutionalize a commitment to diversity and seek to increase the diversity of faculty applicant pools and hires	Used	Partially used ②	Did not use	Not applicable	Not sure/ Other	Comments

a t						0	
	As a hiring committee, clarified and prioritized the diversity needs of the department vs. competing needs (perhaps considering the needs of diverse student populations, the pedagogical value of diverse classroom environments, the potential value-added of diverse thinking/groups in research innovation/implementation).	0	0	0	0	0	
י כ	Compared the relative success of our department to similar programs at peer nstitutions in re. to diversity-related issues and faculty hiring patterns.	0	0	0	0	0	
c i	nvolved the Dean/other administrators/senior faculty in communicating about the mportance of diversity in faculty recruitment (e.g., the Dean or senior faculty directly met with the committee re. diversity issues).	0	0	0	0	0	
1	Made committee members aware of "best practices" referenced in the current academic literature regarding hiring diverse faculty.	0	0	0	0	0	
e a	Required transparency regarding pre-existing relationships between faculty candidates and hiring committee members (perhaps "recusing" in cases where longer-term relationships might bias the evaluation/have undue influence).	0	0	0	0	0	
f is	Conducted retrospective analyses of recent faculty recruitments in regard to diversity ssues (e.g., Were the applicant pools/finalists appropriately diverse?) and took this nformation into account during the current job search.	0	0	0	0	0	
	Existing mechanisms designed to increase the diversity of UC faculty applicant pools and hires	Very	Somewhat	Not too	Not at	Not sure/Other	Comments
		useful	useful	useful		Sui e/ Otiliei	
١.			uooiui		useful	0	
	The information provided in the Fair Hiring for Faculty Recruitment Workshop for search committee members presented by the VPAA?	0	0	0	useful	0	
l s		0		0			
) 1	search committee members presented by the VPAA?		0		0	0	
a s b 1 c = 6	Search committee members presented by the VPAA? The online (Canvas) implicit bias training? The calibration session with real examples of statements of contributions to diversity,	0	0	0	0	0	

		li				
Are there tools or resources that we don't currently	offer that would furth	er assist search cor	nmittees run a su	ccessful academi	c recruitment?	
Did you encounter any obstacles during your recrui	tment? If so, what we	re they? Do you hav	e any suggestions	s for how they cou	ıld be avoided in the future	?
		<i>l</i>)				
Final Comments						
f you have any final comments/thoughts, please pr	ovide them in the belo	ow box.				
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
	Th	ank you for your	helni			
	Previous	Save and exit	Submit survey			