The survey can only be accessed and completed by the Search Committee Chair in AP Recruit, and is available by clicking on the chair survey banner at the top of any webpage within your recruitment

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).

	Job description/specification	Used the practice?					Comments
		Used	Partially used ❓	Did not use	Not applicable	Not sure/ Other ❓	
a	Specified the position in a disciplinary area with relatively high diversity of degree recipients/faculty (based on examination of demographic data or personal observation).	○	○	○	○	○	
b	Coupled the subject area with diversity issues (e.g., "labor and/or women's history" vs. just "labor history").	○	○	○	○	○	
c	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).	○	○	○	○	○	
d	Prioritized recently established disciplinary growth areas or areas of new departmental need rather than looking to replace a retiring faculty member.	○	○	○	○	○	
e	Pursued cluster hires of candidates with diverse backgrounds (multiple faculty positions that are related), perhaps working with other departments or the central administration (e.g., research clusters focused on underserved/diverse populations) to foster them.	○	○	○	○	○	

	Job qualifications/evaluation process	Used the practice?					Comments
		Used	Partially used ❷	Did not use	Not applicable	Not sure/ Other ❷	
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).	○	○	○	○	○	
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.	○	○	○	○	○	
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.	○	○	○	○	○	
i	Required a statement on contributions to diversity from all applicants <u>and</u> actively used the statements in the evaluation process.	○	○	○	○	○	

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 *recruitment phase* of <u>this</u> job search	Used the practice?					Comments
		Used	Partially used ❷	Did not use	Not applicable	Not sure/ Other ❷	
a	Advertised in diversity specific venues in your field (e.g., National Society of Hispanic Physicists).	○	○	○	○	○	
b	Personally contacted colleagues from other institutions to ask for their help in identifying potential applicants from diverse backgrounds.	○	○	○	○	○	
c	Directly called/emailed possible candidates with diverse backgrounds and encouraged them to apply to the position.	○	○	○	○	○	
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.	○	○	○	○	○	
e	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.).	○	○	○	○	○	
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)	**2.** ○	○	○	○	○	

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

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 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.

	Practices to minimize the possible impact of implicit associations throughout the entire search process	Used the practice?					Comments
		Used	**Partially used** ❷	**Did not use**	**Not applicable**	**Not sure/ Other** ❷	
a	Encouraged or required search committee members to attend trainings regarding issues of "implicit associations" and how to minimize their impact.	○	○	○	○	○	
b	Developed in advance of reviewing applications a weighted rubric based on selection criteria that was used in the evaluation of all candidates.	○	○	○	○	○	
c	Took the necessary time to fully evaluate all applications, spending 15 or more minutes on every application.	○	○	○	○	○	
d	Made sure all applications were reviewed by at least two reviewers.	○	○	○	○	○	
e	Appointed senior reviewers or equity advisors to monitor the equity of all recruitment related processes/decisions.	○	○	○	○	○	

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.

	Practices that institutionalize a commitment to diversity and seek to increase the diversity of faculty applicant pools and hires	Used the practice?					Comments
		Used	Partially used ❓	Did not use	Not applicable	Not sure/ Other ❓	
a	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).	○	○	○	○	○	
b	Compared the relative success of our department to similar programs at peer institutions in re. to diversity-related issues and faculty hiring patterns.	○	○	○	○	○	
c	Involved the Dean/other administrators/senior faculty in communicating about the importance of diversity in faculty recruitment (e.g., the Dean or senior faculty directly met with the committee re. diversity issues).	○	○	○	○	○	
d	Made committee members aware of "best practices" referenced in the current academic literature regarding hiring diverse faculty.	○	○	○	○	○	
e	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).	○	○	○	○	○	
f	Conducted retrospective analyses of recent faculty recruitments in regard to diversity issues (e.g., Were the applicant pools/finalists appropriately diverse?) and took this information into account during the current job search.	○	○	○	○	○	

Section 5. Assessing Existing Mechanisms Designed to Promote Diverse Faculty Pools and Hires

Beyond assessing possible "best practices," we would also like to hear your thoughts about existing mechanisms that are currently in place on your campus that are designed to support more diverse faculty applicant pools and hires. Many of these mechanisms/practices have been in place for a number of years (with modifications along the way); but their usefulness has not been fully assessed.

In regard to promoting diverse faculty applicant pools and hires on your campus, how useful/effective do you believe each of the following mechanisms are?

Please share any comments you might have that help us to better interpret your rating. If you have any recommendations, please note them in the comment box.

	Existing mechanisms designed to increase the diversity of UC faculty applicant pools and hires	How USEFUL is the mechanism/practice?					Comments
		Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not too useful	Not at all useful	Not sure/Other ❓	
a	Faculty search plans (required prior to beginning a faculty search)	○	○	○	○	○	
b	Office for Faculty Equity & Welfare's website	○	○	○	○	○	
c	Faculty Search Workshops (sponsored by the Office for Faculty Equity & Welfare)	○	○	○	○	○	
d	Berkeley Faculty Equity Advisors	○	○	○	○	○	

4.

| e | Faculty Relocation Services | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | |

Other existing mechanisms designed to increase the diversity of UC faculty applicant pools and hires.

[text box]

Final Comments

If you have any final comments/thoughts, please provide them in the below box.

[text box]

Thank you for your help!

Previous   Save and exit   Submit survey

5.