

Date: December 8, 2014  
 To: Academic Senate Committees  
 From: Divisional Chair Andre' Knoesen  
 Subject: Academic Senate Review: ADVANCE Policy and Practices Review Initiative-  
 Revised Recruitment Recommendations November 2014

The enclosed recruitment recommendations are provided for formal consultation. As some of you may recall, the Academic Senate provided informal feedback on these recommendations last spring. I would appreciate feedback from all committees. However, below I am listing each recommendation and asking specific committees to comment.

Professor Linda Bisson, UC Davis ADVANCE Associate Director and Policy and Practices Review Initiative Co-Director, has offered to join committee meetings to discuss the recommendations. Please reach out to Linda directly at [lbisson@ucdavis.edu](mailto:lbisson@ucdavis.edu) to invite her to a standing committee meeting.

Consider the following when crafting committee responses:

- Some recommendations suggest on-going workload for specific committees.
- When specific standing committee action is recommended, we **must** receive a response concerning the committee's willingness to assume the work. In addition, please assess the impact of taking on additional routine tasks in relation to the committee's overall effectiveness.
- Some recommendations suggest Divisional action or action based on general faculty impact. Specific committees are being asked to provide advice concerning advisability and desirability of doing so.

In addition to the enclosed recommendations, the Office of Academic Affairs has published a [Ladder Faculty Hiring Analysis by Division](#) for the recruitment period 11/1/2009 through October 31, 2014 at:

[http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/tools/demographic\\_data/LadderFacultyHiringAnalysis%2011012009-10312014.pdf](http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/tools/demographic_data/LadderFacultyHiringAnalysis%2011012009-10312014.pdf)

Number	Recommendation	Response Requested From:
1	Develop a core set of best practices for optimizing inclusiveness in application pools	AA&D, CAP, Faculty Welfare
2	Provide an annual workshop for Associate Deans and Department Chairs on best practices in hiring.	AA&D, CAP, Faculty Welfare
3	Evaluate and enhance college/school level review of position descriptions and search plans.	AA&D, CAP & FPCs as appropriate, CPB, All Faculty Executive Committees
4	Create an effective UC-wide website for the advertisement of faculty positions. NOTE: Suggests Academic Senate annual report review. Which committee(s) should review such a report?	AA&D, CAP, Faculty Welfare, All Faculty Executive Committees

5	Generate an institutional statement on commitment to inclusiveness to be included in all position announcements.	AA&D
6	Review current practices with respect to search waivers.	AA&D, CAP, CPB, Faculty Welfare
7	Enable commitment to diversity statements to be included in the application process.	AA&D, CAP, Faculty Welfare
8	Require STEAD ( <i>Strength Through Equity And Diversity</i> ) training of all search committee and department chairs and ultimately of all faculty engaged in faculty review and evaluation.	AA&D, CAP, Faculty Welfare, All Faculty Executive Committees
9	Eliminate valuation of gendered traits in pool evaluation. NOTE: Suggests a joint Senate/Administration Committee.	AA&D, CAP, Faculty Welfare, All Faculty Executive Committees
10	Include awareness of the impact of pedigree bias in the current training of chairs and faculty search committees.	AA&D, CAP, Faculty Welfare, All Faculty Executive Committees
11	Reward mentorship activity in advancement. NOTE: Suggests Academic Senate and Federation coordinate efforts in mentorship across the campus.	AA&D, CAP, UGC, Graduate Council
12	Establish clear policies on expectations of early career workload balance.	COC, Faculty Welfare, All Faculty Executive Committees.
13	Align University and federal family friendly policies via lobbying of federal granting agencies to institute cost-extensions for parental leave.	Faculty Welfare, COR, CPB
14	Enhance childcare and caregiver support programs.	Faculty Welfare
15	Enhance visibility of family friendly policies during recruitment.	
16	Create a program of faculty career peer advisors.	Faculty Welfare, All Faculty Executive Committees
17	Create a dual career program.	CAP, Faculty Welfare, CPB
18	Create an online comprehensive faculty handbook.	Faculty Welfare

Given the workload associated with this review, we are allocating additional time for response.

cc: Professor Linda Bisson

Enclosure: Revised PPRI Recommendations

ADVANCE Policy and Practices Review Initiative  
Revised Recruitment Recommendations November 2014

The UC Davis ADVANCE program aims to increase the participation of URM (Underrepresented minorities) women in STEM fields (science, technology, engineering and mathematics). The overall campus goal is to create an enabling environment and to “build a vibrant, welcoming and diverse STEM research community”. A second goal is to establish an institution-wide, inclusive STEM climate that values and embraces diversity. In the *State of the Worlds Science, 2014*, article by Victoria Plaut “3 Myths Plus a Few Best Practices for Achieving Diversity” she succinctly states the problem under the heading:

**“Forget Color Blindness**

Perhaps an ideal world exists in which race or gender is beside the point in the office or classroom. In our world, however, most people find it easier to thrive in an actively supportive environment in which it is safe to be different.”

This is our overall objective, to move from policies and practices encouraging color and gender blindness that emphasize our core commonality to those that recognize, embrace and support our differences.

ADVANCE also plans to develop and provide programs and resources that will empower individuals for a STEM academic career and promote equitable advancement. The effectiveness of programs, practices and policies developed to meet these goals will be assessed on an ongoing basis.

The specific charge to the Committee for the ADVANCE Policy and Practices Review Initiative is to conduct a systematic review of policies and procedures that impact recruitment, retention and career progress of faculty and, when deemed necessary, propose changes to those policies and practices to eradicate implicit bias, promote diversity and eliminate inconsistency in implementation. In our first two years of deliberations we have reached the same conclusion as that recently espoused by Virginia Plaut that there is a fundamental conflict between implicit bias and reliance on gender and color blind policies and elimination of the impact of implicit bias in review and advancement requires first embracing our differences as the foundation of inclusiveness.

Our recommendations will be presented to the Davis Division of the Academic Senate in draft form for consideration and modification. Comments and suggestions received from the campus community will be used to craft the final set of recommendations that will be submitted for formal review and implementation as appropriate. We are also charged with developing online spaces for protected faculty feedback on policies and implementation which will be done in conjunction with the Davis Division of the Academic Senate and the UC Davis Federation. We have divided our charge into four sections: recruitment, faculty advancement and the reward system, career development and retention. Four separate reports will be generated each focusing on one of these topics.

This report constitutes a final set of recommendations for recruitment, following Senate and Federation consultation in the spring of 2014. The invaluable feedback provided from the consultation process has led to changes in some of the recommendations of the draft report and in some cases withdrawal of recommendations. We thank those commenting on the draft for their assessments of the original recommendations. Recommendations deemed more appropriate for a future report have been moved to those reports. This set of final recommendations for recruitment of a diverse faculty is divided into three specific components: pool composition, pool evaluation and creating and sustaining an attractive working environment.

### ***POOL COMPOSITION***

Achieving a diverse faculty requires achieving a diverse pool of applicants. Recent analyses of potential pool composition (PhD degrees awarded) suggests that some of the early barriers that forced leaks in the pipeline have been addressed but there still remains a greater attrition of women and URM from the tenure-track position pipeline. However there is a greater diversity in pipeline pools now than at any time in our history. There are several approaches that have been taken by other institutions that have enhanced the diversity of their applicant pools and faculty and we make the following recommendations to attain enhanced diversity of our own applicant pools.

Most common among these other institutions is the establishment of detailed review of position requests assuring that they meet key institutional goals. Although extensive over-sight and micromanagement can be effective in some circumstances we favor instead establishment of practices that are able to be easily followed by all hiring units avoiding a lengthy review process. Criticisms of the draft report included the belief that the ADVANCE program is unnecessary because we as an institution have achieved color and gender blindness. We have made great strides but the fact remains that women and URM degree holders are underrepresented in STEM applicant pools and faculty ranks. Blindness policies ignore the role of implicit bias in decision making and as a consequence do not fully nurture diversity and inclusivity.

*Recommendation 1: Develop a core set of best practices for optimizing inclusiveness in application pools*

Pool composition is impacted by a variety of practices. Given the scarcity of URM applicants in the pipeline, narrowly written or constricted job descriptions may lead to small applicant pools and potentially send the message that the position was written with specific applicants in mind. Other institutions have found that unconstricted searches lead to a more diverse pool and a more diverse faculty. “Unconstricted” in this case means job descriptions that span a discipline or even span multiple disciplines. On the other hand, if an unconstricted search leads to several hundred applicants the practices employed to narrow down the number of applicants to a manageable level for review, such as requiring a high number of first author publications or valuing specific

pedigrees or publications as first author in top tier outlets, can severely reduce diversity even below that of a more constricted search.

Feedback from campus raised several issues with respect to broadened or unconstricted searches and it is clear that one policy will not fit all units and situations. In fact, none of the responders across campus was in favor of an unconstricted search policy defined as broadly covering a discipline or spanning disciplines. Although reasons unconstricted searches were thought unworkable varied across units, one underlying commonality of concern was the lack of flexibility in Department/hiring unit budgets and the increased demands on Departments/hiring units in providing for space and start-up funding. Equally cited was the lack of flexibility with respect to meeting specific teaching or graduate student training needs. Some responders also commented that there is significant diversity in applicant pools already but that competition for top candidates in general is fierce and our offer packages, especially faculty salaries, were simply not competitive. The extent to which Departments are expected to share the fiscal burden of new hires appears to vary by college and school and there is a lack of transparency even within units. The lack of flexibility in Department/hiring unit resources and work demands will reduce if not negate the effectiveness of any policy encouraging unconstricted searches.

*We recommend instead that, understanding this inflexibility, the campus develop a core set of best practices that foster pool inclusivity and that can be applied to each search.*

The first step in achieving the goal of developing a core set of best practices for inclusivity is to understand our current review processes for position requests and searches. In current campus practice an Interim Recruitment Report (IRR) is required for all ladder rank faculty searches that must be approved by the Dean of the College or School. In 2013 the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) began requiring deans to provide the IRR to her office for evaluation, comment, and (where indicated) a recommendation to the Dean to either approve or disapprove the IRR (see: [https://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/local\\_resources/docs/VP\\_advisories/AA2013-08\\_Advisory\\_to\\_Deans\\_-\\_New\\_Process\\_for\\_Approval\\_of\\_Interim\\_Recruitment\\_Reports\\_091313.pdf](https://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/local_resources/docs/VP_advisories/AA2013-08_Advisory_to_Deans_-_New_Process_for_Approval_of_Interim_Recruitment_Reports_091313.pdf)). Evaluation of diversity (as defined by gender and ethnicity) is part of this process. The office of the VPAA will compare the diversity of the applicant pool, the “strongly considered” pool, and the “short list” pool against workforce-specific diversity information available through RECRUIT. According to Everett Wilson, who is the Data Coordinator in Academic Affairs, the workforce-specific diversity information comes from:

“...The figures are based on an annual survey of PhD's performed by the National Organization Research Center (NORC: <http://www.norc.org/Research/Projects/Pages/survey-of-earned-doctorates-%28sed%29.aspx>) on behalf of six federal agencies (National Science Foundation, National Institute of Health, Department of Education, National Endowment for the Humanities, United States Department of Agriculture, and NASA). The latest year's results can be viewed on the NORC web site, a good overview can be found on the NSF web site at: <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvydoctorates/#sd>. The survey includes

gender/ethnicity and the field of service most closely associated with a given PhD's study.”

However, many of our own department and graduate programs, especially those administered by graduate groups, do not fit into standard national categories. The IRR review needs to be mindful of this fact. The office of the VPAA also examines the hiring goals for the department and college/school. If the diversity of the pool (and especially the short list pool) is below that expected by the workforce-specific figures provided, or will not potentially contribute to the hiring goals, then the VPAA can recommend that the Dean not approve the IRR and either fail the search or keep the search underway until the diversity of the pools increases. However the review process appears to focus on color and gender “blindness” of the pool and may not be sufficient in attaining diversity goals. It is important to make sure that applicants know that we as a campus truly value that which makes us different as that is at the heart of inclusiveness. Departments need to be made aware of the best practices for obtaining a diverse pool and we as a campus must understand the factors at play when the pool does not attain the desired diversity.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) should prepare an annual report categorizing searches by the levels of diversity in the applicant, strongly considered and short list pools of the searches conducted in that year that have been completed. This report should be given to the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (AA&D) for review along with the approved IRRs. The AA&D committee can then compare the outcomes to the actual processes followed in the search to identify those practices that foster inclusivity. Their findings should be reported on a regular basis to the campus community identifying key best practices so that the adoption of best practices will become widespread. We further suggest that the annual reporting to the academic community described above be done at the systemwide level to take full advantage of the efforts in obtaining greater inclusivity that are currently being conducted on all ten campuses; AA&D may wish to take this suggestion forward to the systemwide Affirmative Action and Diversity Committee.

*Recommendation 2: Provide an annual workshop for Associate Deans and Department Chairs on best practices in hiring*

The information gained in review of current practices and outcomes should also be translated into useful information that can be shared with the local campus administrators at the forefront of our hiring and recruitment efforts. This workshop should provide discussion of the appropriate levels of constriction in searches, training options for search committees and Department faculty and serve as a means by which the participants in the workshop can inform the VPAA and each other of issues impacting recruitment, pool composition and success in attraction of the top candidate.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The VPAA should develop a workshop or include in an existing workshop a discussion of best practices in hiring that includes opportunity for dialog among participants.

*Recommendation 3: Evaluate and enhance college/school level review of position descriptions and search plans*

Aligned with recommendation 1 and 2 is the need to then apply the best practices information obtained to searches within a unit and across units. This recommendation has two components. The first component is the assessment of current college and school practices for review of both position requests and search plans employed by Dean's offices. The point of generation of the IRR may be too late in the process to make the meaningful changes that will have an impact on pool demographics. We assume all review practices are in compliance with the APM, but perhaps that is not the case. If practices are not in compliance with the APM they should be altered to become compliant. Alternately if the language of the APM is not conducive to best practices, the APM should be changed. The second component of this recommendation is to develop clear guidelines for search review and approvals that can be applied campus-wide.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The VPAA should request of each unit Dean (college or school) documentation of current practices in position and search plan review for their unit. This should include practices used for cross-departmental searches should those be conducted by the unit. These plans would be submitted to the Senate committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity, Committee on Academic Personnel, Faculty Personnel Committees of the unit and to the Committee on Planning and Budget and to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs for review and comment. The results of the Senate review should be given to the VPAA so that the VPAA can develop better guidelines for review of search plans and recruitment reports mindful of the constraints imposed by limited local resources.

*Recommendation 4: Create an effective UC-wide website for the advertisement of faculty positions*

Currently all UC positions are linked to a common website ([jobs.universityofcalifornia.edu](http://jobs.universityofcalifornia.edu)) and many of our campuses participate in HERC (Higher Education Recruitment Consortium: <http://www.hercjobs.org/>). Pool diversity improves when positions are advertised broadly and it is important to know what outlets are used most often by prospective candidates in seeking positions. Departments are given some leeway in selection of outlets for position advertising at UCD and there are budgetary constraints that may force less than optimal outreach for recruitment of applicants. Departments also use targeted emails to colleagues and departments that produce talented postdoctoral fellows and graduate students in areas of interest. Other departments advertise more strongly at national conferences and candidates interested

in positions often attend these recruitment sessions at those conferences. Thus it would be difficult to develop one core set of best practices for advertisement of all positions as disciplines vary in terms of optimal outlets for reaching candidates. We propose bringing the candidates to us by creating a high-profile single easy to search and navigate site for all UC positions. The current site links to individual campus sites and the quality of the postings and ease of access to further information about the position varies dramatically (compare UCB to UCD for example). We are concerned that this variation in presentation style can be a deterrent to applicants. It is also not clear how many Departments know of and utilize the HERC site since some faculty we spoke with were unaware of its existence. The HERC site provides a searchability not found on the UC site. Using these kinds of search sites and drawing applicants to us across disciplines in a coordinated fashion would reduce the need for individualized advertising plans that require oversight and review. This site could also be linked to regional dual career hiring networks and enable UC to take a lead in recruiting other academic institutions and corporations to these dual career networks. This portal could be easily linked to positions within Recruit and the Recruit application process should include a query of how the candidate first heard of the position. How candidates hear of the position could then be used to formulate best practices for attaining a diverse applicant pool.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The VPAA should provide a report on use of the HERC site in attracting applicant pools and provide a report to the Academic Senate and the campus on the routes through which successful candidates initially obtained information about available positions. If this information is not readily attainable, we suggest that a survey be conducted of faculty hires within the last five years to identify the most important advertising outlets. We also suggest that at a minimum our job descriptions on the UC jobs site be redesigned to be more similar to those of UCB and UCM that provide easy scanning and searchability for academic positions (<http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/programs-and-initiatives/academic-job-openings/index.html>). We also suggest that the VPAA forward to systemwide the suggestion that all campuses have a similar look for their job postings as linked from the systemwide jobs site.

*Recommendation 5: Generate an institutional statement on commitment to inclusiveness to be included on all position announcements*

Many campuses are creating positions that require evidence of a commitment to diversity on the part of the successful candidate as a means to both addressing remaining issues in the pipeline, providing diverse role models, and achieving an inclusive environment. We recommend that language be developed that will clearly state UCD's commitment to and valuation of diversity and inclusiveness. Currently the minimalist statement required at UCD for all applications (APM UCD500 exhibit D) is: "The University of California is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer." This statement is inconsistent with the UC-wide minimum statement "The University of California is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex,

national origin, disability, age or protected veteran status.” Both statements emphasize the “blindness” of our policies, but fall short of stating a firm commitment to inclusiveness and the creation of an environment in which it is safe to be different.

We therefore suggest UCD develop a clear institutional statement documenting our commitment to inclusion and that this statement be required on all position announcements. We offer as a suggestion the following or similar language be included in all position announcements, not just those limited to STEM:

**“UCD is committed to mentorship of students, staff and faculty including those from underrepresented and underserved populations and creating a vibrant and inclusive educational environment. We especially seek applications from candidates who share this vision.”**

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

We suggest the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity develop suitable language for an institutional statement of commitment to inclusiveness or alternatively suggest a much more expanded statement such as that of Cornell University (<http://diversity.cornell.edu/commitment-to-inclusion>) to propose to the campus for implementation.

*Recommendation 6: Review current practices with respect to search waivers*

The PPRI received several comments from faculty stating that search waivers are being used in ways inconsistent with campus and UC policy. In their response to our draft recommendations the Committee on Academic Personnel stated that the PPRI view of search waivers was “outdated” and “other programs are also currently granted search waivers”. The PPRI view of search waivers was taken directly from administrative websites and it appears that interpretation and implementation of policy might have diverged from historical practices and from descriptions of current practices on websites. Current policy is to allow departmental initiated requests for search waivers only in cases of TOE appointments (<https://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/programs/target-excel/index.html>). However, UCD APM 500 exhibit b lists the conditions under which academic appointments may be exempted from search requirements (<http://manuals.ucdavis.edu/apm/500b.pdf>). This includes discussion of acting or temporary faculty appointments, POP’s, emergency appointments needed to meet critical teaching or clinical needs and a vague statement on exceptions for recruiting faculty with unique experiences and accomplishments that matches the language used for selection of the President’s Postdoctoral Fellows. Section 500b also includes information on search waivers for grant funded programs when it is clear that the individual hired is so uniquely qualified that they would have been hired anyway should a search have been conducted. From the broader comments received by PPRI it is clear that some faculty interpret 500b as applicable to “non-Senate” academic appointees and this needs to be clarified. It is not clear to the campus community how search waivers are being defined, used and granted on this campus. Waivers are viewed as the antithesis to unconstricted or open searches.

This lack of transparency and alignment of practice with stated policy seems to be fueling the faculty concern that search waivers are being used in ways that clearly violate policy. We therefore recommend that the VPAA in collaboration with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the Committee on Planning and budget (CPB) provide a detailed assessment of the ways in which search waivers are currently being used and the criteria employed in reviewing each request and that campus websites be updated accordingly to provide greater transparency to the faculty as a whole. An additional component of this recommendation is to include local unit practices for requesting search waivers as it seems this varies by school and college as well. Finally, the diversity of the search waiver pool with that of full searches should be compared and reported to the campus. There is a strong feeling among faculty that search waivers should be avoided as their use can introduce bias into the hiring process and it would be important to have data to support or refute this concern. Indeed we heard from one faculty member that search waivers in his unit were used to save the cost of a full search. We sincerely hope that is not a driver in the approval of search waivers.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The VPAA and CAP should initially provide a clear statement on the ways that search waivers are currently being used and candidates evaluated. That document should be reviewed in draft form by CPB. The consistency of these practices with the language of the APM should be addressed. Once a consensus between the administration and the Academic Senate is reached on use of waivers, the criteria for search waivers should be updated on campus websites, including a clear description of the process and circumstances under which a search waiver is appropriate. As criteria or practice change it is vital that sites be updated to maintain complete transparency in the use of waivers.

*Recommendation 7: Enable commitment to diversity statements to be included in the application process*

If recommendation #5 is adopted, a clear campus commitment to diversity will be stated in each position announcement. As a companion to this recommendation we also propose the inclusion of a diversity statement in the application process via Recruit similar to the one used in advancement actions of faculty. We will need to provide examples of the types of commitments that are currently being made by existing faculty as guidance for the type of commitment we are seeking in applicants and provide guidance to departments and review committees on how to interpret such statements. UCSD has just started such a program and uses these statements as part of the evaluation of candidates.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The VPAA should make (or commission) the changes necessary to the Recruit site to enable inclusion of diversity statements as part of the application process. We also suggest that the AA&D along with the VPAA develop examples of current faculty diversity efforts. These examples will serve both as a tribute to the work that faculty are engaged in as well as illustrate the types of service available on campus. AA&D should also develop a guide on how to interpret diversity statements and use these guidelines in conjunction with other metrics used in identification of the final successful candidate.

## ***POOL EVALUATION***

Equally important as advertising broadly and addressing pool composition issues is the development of best practices for evaluation and review of that pool. Schemas or implicit bias have been shown repeatedly to negatively impact equitable review of women and URM faculty. From a policy perspective, our policies do not reinforce implicit bias but neither do they correct for its existence. We view two components to bias that can negatively impact career advancement: the existence of implicit bias or schematic thinking and bias introduced by career trajectory or pedigree.

### *Schema Abatement*

*Recommendation 8: Require STEAD (Strength Through Equity And Diversity) training of all search committee and department chairs and ultimately of all faculty engaged in faculty review and evaluation.*

The formation of schemas or expectations of behavior of an individual based on their identification as a member of a group are implicit and therefore difficult to ignore. Other institutions have addressed this problem through the targeted training of search and review committees. Indeed a component of this ADVANCE grant is to develop similar training for UCD and the ADVANCE Committee for an Inclusive Campus Climate has developed a training program called STEAD that will be invaluable in the training of search committees in understanding implicit bias in its multiple forms and how it impacts review of applicants.

### *Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

We support the plan to require all search committee members to undergo STEAD training to recognize the many forms that implicit bias might take in record review. However we think implicit bias is pervasive throughout the academy and all of its disciplines. Therefore we recommend that we develop mechanisms for the training of all faculty, senate and non-senate, to recognize implicit bias so that we may all serve as agents of change to external bodies to increase more global awareness of the cultural aspects of disadvantage in our respective disciplines. Further the type of training required should involve consultation with the Deans of the respective units. Some Deans expressed a desire to have all departmental faculty trained with less of an

emphasis on search committees. The role of the search committee recommendations may vary in weight across the campus.

*Recommendation 9: Eliminate valuation of gendered traits in pool evaluation*

Gendered traits in this context are defined as traits that are associated with academic success but that are often viewed negatively in women. In their discussion of implicit bias the 2007 NAS report “Beyond Bias and Barriers” notes that assertiveness and single-mindedness are stereotyped as socially unacceptable in women” ([http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=11741](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11741); comment 6, page 4). The report also discusses the evolution of the characteristics of the “ideal” scientist and the gendered basis of such characteristics. The concept of the ideal STEM scholar is often imbued with traits such as excelling at self-promotion, aggressively competitive, stingy with both time and credit given to others, a tough negotiator and dedicated to career as evidenced by a lack of worklife balance. Often these traits, when expressed by those groups not normally considered to possess them, can be viewed as negative. Similarly if those traits are not expressed by a member of the group thought to possess them that individual can be equally disadvantaged. Evaluation committee training should include recognition of these traits as gendered and not correlated with true impact of scientific discoveries as outlined in the 2007 NAS report “Beyond Bias and Barriers”.

Over the past three decades, color and gender blind policies and practices have encouraged all STEM students to develop these gendered traits to be successful along with the companion efforts to convince review committees to apply valuation of these traits equitably and without gender or ethnic bias. The fact that we still have the problem in spite of decades of effort suggests that a different approach might be needed. Also it is not clear if there is in fact a true correlation between expression of these gendered traits and the innovation and impact of creative activity and research programs.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

This recommendation seeks to truly transform the institution into one of inclusivity that respects and supports differences and diversion from the historical definition of the ideal scientist as so clearly described in “Beyond Bias and Barriers”. A joint administrative-Academic Senate- Federation task force should be appointed and charged with review of the NAS report, our current operational definitions of the ideal STEM faculty profile, and asked to make recommendations to redefine the ideal STEM faculty member in today’s inclusive environment.

*Pedigree Bias*

*Recommendation 10: Include awareness of the impact of pedigree bias in the current training of chairs and faculty search committees.*

A second form of bias that can become a factor in both evaluation of candidates and in reduction of pool size is the placement of a high value on a specific scientific

pedigree during the review process. Indeed, responses from some faculty on campus indicate that pedigree is the most important factor considered in hires by their units and they defended that practice as assuring quality of the faculty hire as the pedigree assures a prior screening of accomplishment of the candidate. Faculty also stated that pools are sufficiently diverse even when considering academic pedigree. URM faculty in particular often have non-traditional career paths such as starting at a community college rather than a research institution or having gotten advanced degrees at universities not considered to be top tier even when their record of accomplishment matches that of traditional path candidates. For some positions, particularly in narrowly defined sub-specialties, the pool may be constricted by a focus on targeted recruitment from a small set of Departments considered to be top in the field. Both of these practices can narrow pool composition unnecessarily.

#### *Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The VPAA should assess the role of recruitment of candidates by institutional pedigree in search committee selection of candidates for the short list. The IRR could include statements regarding how the candidate initially found out about the position and the impact of pedigree targeting on the pool and the selection of the final candidate could be assessed. This data should be provided in a report given to the Academic Senate and the AA&D committee.

### **CREATING AND SUSTAINING AN ATTRACTIVE WORKING ENVIRONMENT**

The final task in development of a diverse faculty workforce is the creation of an enabling work environment that will be attractive to faculty candidates and create the inclusive, vibrant community that we seek. Two other ADVANCE committees, the Committee for an Inclusive Campus Climate and the Committee for Mentorship and Networking as well as the CAMPOS Initiative, are developing programs that will be critical to the creation of a highly attractive work environment for URM STEM faculty. We suggest that those programs being created and reports generated by those groups undergo Senate review. From the policy and practices perspective we offer the following recommendation.

#### *Recommendation 11: Reward mentorship activity in advancement*

APM210 includes language specifying the importance of mentorship for instance: “mentoring and advising of students or new faculty are to be encouraged and given recognition in the teaching or service categories of academic personnel actions”. Inclusion of opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the university is given as an example of appropriate documentation of mentorship ability. However often such letters are considered as not “arm’s length” by reviewing bodies and are discounted in the review process. Also a concern raised by CAP is the lack of an ability to provide anonymity to a mentee should they wish to provide negative comments in the review of a mentor. This is of course an important

concern as the mentor/mentoree relationship extends beyond the time spent under the direct guidance of the mentor. CAP also pointed out the challenges with having any metrics of good mentorship. However the Faculty COACHE survey indicated a strong concern across faculty of a devaluation of mentorship on this campus and rated mentorship as a highly important activity. The ADVANCE Mentoring and Networking Initiative is developing mentorship programs and guidelines to address these and other concerns regarding the quality of and rewards for excellence in mentoring on this campus.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The *State of the Worlds Science, 2014*, and the articles in Nature and Scientific American derived therefrom cite the critical role played by mentorship in the diversification of the academy. The campus should create a mentorship council comprised of representation from the administration, Academic Senate and Federation to coordinate efforts in mentorship across campus. There are many local mentorship programs as well as those overseen by Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council and the ADVANCE program. The mentorship council should have as a charge clearly defining the breadth and scope of mentorship and establish clear criteria for assessment of effectiveness in mentorship of both our programs and for reviewing bodies. A strong and visible mentorship program and campus commitment is vital in attracting junior faculty to campus.

*Recommendation 12: Establish clear policies on expectations of early career workload balance*

In some cases reduced junior faculty workloads are part of the negotiation process and as a consequence there is a tendency for expected early workloads to not be equitable across STEM junior faculty. Workload reductions often take the form of reduced service and teaching loads for an initial period of time to allow the faculty member the time needed to develop their area of scholarship. The time demands of establishing a research laboratory and securing funding can indeed be severe. We recommend a uniform policy of workload reduction be developed by the campus and equitably applied to all new junior faculty. We realize it may be easier in some departments to offer reduced workloads without impacting the workload of other faculty and this also needs to be taken into account in the development and implementation of these policies.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

Clear unit policies for junior faculty workloads should be developed by each Dean and reviewed by college/unit senate faculty personnel and executive committees. Policies should then go forward to the Committee on Planning and Budget and the VPAA for review prior to implementation at the unit level.

*Recommendation 13: Align University and federal family friendly policies via lobbying of federal granting agencies to institute automatic cost- extensions for parental leave*

The inflexibility of timelines of federal grants can negate institutional family friendly policies in those STEM fields where obtaining such grants is critical to establishment of a record of accomplishment. Providing no-cost extensions in cases of parental leave ignores the fact that at UCD the majority of the funding is being used to support the research team rather than the faculty member and a hiatus in funding will have a negative impact on the individuals with salaries or stipends covered on the grant. It is simply not possible to shut down the entire research enterprise during a parental leave.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The UCD administration should take the lead in urging the UC administration to work with federal granting agencies to develop policies for the fully-funded automatic extension of federal grants for the period of the approved worklife leave. Although family leave policies are largely mandated by state law, the federal government should partner in compliance with these policies for federally funded research. Rather than an extension of individual grants which may pose a nightmare of documentation and excessive paperwork, an alternative would be to develop a mechanism by which the funding of this program be included in overhead requests with the funds going to a specific pool to be used to augment grants for parental and other approved leaves mutually agreed to by both the University and the granting agency. We suggest the Committee on Planning and Budget and the Committee on Research along with the VPAA develop a strategy for aligning federal and local leave policy and bring the request forward to the systemwide Committee on Planning and Budget and to the Office of the President respectively for endorsement and review, then for systemwide review as this would need to be a systemwide policy applicable to all individuals funded from research grants.

*Recommendation 14: Enhance childcare and caregiver support programs*

One factor often raised by faculty with young children as needing attention and improvement is the availability on campus of quality childcare at affordable costs. In fact, investment in child care is associated with a positive campus climate and commitment to equitable faculty advancement (Trower, 2013 Success on the Tenure Track: Five Keys to Faculty Job Satisfaction, Chapter 4). While we do have some programs in this area we recommend a review of their effectiveness and availability for faculty in light of Trower's recommendations in this area. She cites the importance of child care facilities locally located (within the school or college) that would be amenable to work schedules of faculty, meaning the potential for extended hours to capture faculty that may need on occasion to leave early to make a meeting off-campus or who may need to arrive late to participate in key networking opportunities such as dinners for invited speakers.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The Committee on Faculty Welfare should review the recommendations in Trower's book and make recommendations specific to our campus based on their findings and the specifics of our local culture for the enhanced provision of child care on campus.

*Recommendation 15: Enhance visibility of family friendly policies during recruitment*

Faculty expressed confusion over the legalities of discussing family friendly policies with candidates during campus visits. The belief among faculty is that they are not to raise these issues or bring them up with candidates unless directly asked a question, but then how do the candidates become generally informed of our policies and local practices? We agree with the Academic Senate request that Chairs and/or Deans initiate a verbal description of family leave policies in all recruitments regardless of the gender of the candidate and provide information on the location of descriptions of resources available to faculty. This discussion could be included in a broader discussion of UC and UC Davis benefits thus eliminating the need of the applicant to initiate such a discussion.

*Recommendation 16: Create a program of faculty career peer advisors*

Mentoring is a critical component of both career success and career satisfaction and is highly valued by faculty on the UCD campus as evidenced in our COACHE survey results. Matching faculty with good mentors is a goal of the Mentoring and Networking Initiative but faculty may have questions and issues that they would feel more comfortable bringing up with a knowledgeable individual not part of their normal networks or departments. The creation of Faculty Career Advisors that would function similarly to the current Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisors is suggested.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

Executive Council should consider the formation of Faculty Career Advisors. In addition the existence of the Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisors should be advertised better so that faculty realize that this expertise is available.

*Recommendation 17: Create a dual career program*

Our current Partner Opportunity Program is important in the recruitment of dual career couples and individuals of a dual career couple and the importance of such

programs was highlighted in Trower's Success on the Tenure Track: Five Keys to Faculty Job Satisfaction (2013). However by its very name the POP program reinforces that one spouse is the "leading spouse" career-wise and the other the "trailing spouse". In contrast, other campuses with dual career programs do not make valuations of the relative importance of the two careers. This recommendation received significant negative feedback from the perspective that dual career hires have been historically unsuccessful on this campus largely because of lack of flexibility in department resources as discussed under recommendation #1. It is not clear the extent to which dual career offers have been used or have failed on this campus.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The VPAA should prepare a report on the campus success rate with respect to POP offers. A failure in this case is defined as the loss of the top candidate to which an offer was made because a partner could not be accommodated in an acceptable position on campus with particular emphasis on requests for dual faculty appointments. This review should delineate the successes and failures in providing dual career opportunities and define the elements of a successful outcome. Once the data are generated and analyzed, the campus should consider transforming the POP program into a Dual Career program patterned after successful dual career programs on other campuses as described by Trower.

*Recommendation 18: Create an online comprehensive faculty handbook*

As noted in Do Babies Matter (2013) surveys indicate that a majority of faculty are unaware of institutional family friendly policies and the availability of these programs. Trower also cites in Success on the Tenure Track: Five Keys to Faculty Job Satisfaction (2013) the importance of having a one-stop clearly presented web site with easily searchable and findable policies and practices for every aspect of faculty life. We recommend that resources be provided to the Academic Senate to create such an on-line faculty handbook that would be easy to navigate and be comprehensive. We suggest this handbook could be loosely patterned after the one at Stanford (<http://facultyhandbook.stanford.edu/>) that includes both policy statements akin to our APM but also information on programs available to faculty.

*Suggested Process for Moving Forward:*

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in cooperation with the UCD administration should develop a workable plan for creating a one-stop site that provides a comprehensive faculty guide to campus resources and policies. This would benefit current faculty as well as those considering applying to a position at our institution. Our current practice of scattering such information across administrative web sites requires an in-depth of knowledge of "who does what" not common among new applicants or even among current faculty.

