ADVANCE PAID
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

DATA SEMINAR 2

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2013

UC OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OAKLAND, CA

1111 FRANKLIN STREET, LOBBY ONE

February 2013 Data Seminar Report: Increasing UC's Faculty Diversity Through Comprehensive Data Collection and Recruitment Practices

The UC ADVANCE PAID program hosted its second Data Seminar to share the data results of the 2011-12 faculty recruitment efforts, present UC Recruit system improvements and new methodologies for collecting recruitment and retention data, and increase communication across campuses regarding recruitment practices. **Susan Carlson**, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and the program's Principal Investigator, welcomed attendees and spoke about ADVANCE PAID's overall objective: to build a STEM faculty that reflects the diverse population of UC students and the citizens of California. Following Dr. Carlson's remarks, representatives from the Office of Academic Personnel made three reports:

- **Nancy Tanaka**, Executive Director, discussed the newly established UC Recruit Governance Board, a ten-campus collaboration. Each campus has been invited to send a member to the Board; eight campuses are currently represented. The board's mission is to make recommendations to the Provost/Executive Vice President and Vice Provost of Academic Personnel about which system enhancements should be given priority given the long list of requests already in the queue.

- **Matt Xavier**, Data Coordinator, provided an update on the progress of the Data Group, which was formed to define STEM disciplines, identify methods of tracking recruitment waivers, address the standardization of ethnicity categories, and determine faculty international status.

- **Janet Lockwood**, Manager of Academic Policy and Compensation, gave a detailed presentation on a new methodology for defining international faculty. International faculty will be more broadly categorized as those faculty who are not U.S. citizens, and domestic faculty as those with U.S. citizenship. Further, race and ethnicity will be disaggregated by U.S. citizenship, allowing for finer analyses of faculty diversity across the UC system.

Marc Goulden (Director of Data Initiatives, Faculty Equity and Welfare, UC Berkeley) presented "New Methodologies for Gathering and Collecting Data to Enhance Faculty Diversity: Analyzing the Effectiveness of the UC Faculty Recruitment Practices in Regards to Diversity." Dr. Goulden began by asking, "How do we (UC) know if we are effectively recruiting faculty, and what is our labor pool?" In order to describe the pool, the Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED), a data set in existence since the 1920s, is employed. The annual SED is a census of those who receive PhDs by discipline from U.S. Institutions. In general, when faculty search committees at UC increase the diversity of their applicant pools (particularly underrepresented minority applicants), the number of diverse hires also increases. The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), which has a broader definition of the doctorate, also provides PhD data. During the recruitment process, it is imperative to assess faculty applicant values/interests. Therefore, we should poll faculty applicants about what is important to them; for example, is intellectual stimulation a key criterion in deciding on employment? Dr. Goulden has deployed a survey to hiring committees chairs to self-evaluate the search process.

Herbie Lee (Vice Provost, Academic Affairs, UC Santa Cruz) spoke about UCSC's Faculty Retention Survey. The survey, which has been conducted for the past three years, focuses on ladder rank faculty and is given during a retention action in which a faculty member committed to stay or decided to leave. Dr. Lee noted that salary and partner accommodation both played a major role in the decision to leave or stay. Fortunately, the unique intellectual community at UCSC has been helpful in retention across gender/ethnicity groups, and although women are underrepresented relative to UCSC faculty as a whole, there are no overarching diversity issues as of yet. Almost every faculty member asked for a counter offer which seems to be a common campuswide practice.

The UC ADVANCE PAID Program is supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation. Grant no. HRD 1106712

1

Anna Everett (Acting Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Academic Policy, UC Santa Barbara) led a group discussion about the morning's presentations. UC Berkeley, UC Santa Cruz, and UC San Francisco also conduct exit interviews/surveys, which provide useful information, but are often difficult to analyze given the individualized results. The process is also time-consuming. Faculty surveys that capture soft/informal inquiries from other schools by division heads/deans do not collect comparable data. One campus reported that when faculty left for an outside offer, there was no significant difference in current salary with regard to gender.

Some questions that emerged during the discussion included the following: Is there a major disconnect between applicant pools and hiring? Why are individuals not choosing UCs? What are the key reasons people do not come to UC? What can be done about this? If pipeline issues exist for UC graduate students, perhaps we can study and address the larger problem. Access to and availability of childcare is one reason women exit the pipeline. UCSB's campus climate survey revealed that the time spent on a waiting list for daycare was between 8 months and 1½ years; other campuses have similar wait times. UCSF suggested "outsourcing" to local daycare providers. Childcare is a "huge issue" for women and URM faculty and has been studied intensively at UC Berkeley.

Susan Drange Lee, Director for Faculty Diversity and Development at UC Los Angeles, presented on unconscious bias during the faculty recruitment process. Drange Lee conducts faculty search committee trainings at UCLA where, to date, 32% of regular rank general campus faculty and 270 faculty from the School of Medicine have attended a training. These trainings, which began in 2007, require a two-hour briefing for a search committee chair and one other member of the committee. It is critical to the search process that search criteria be agreed upon from the start and consequently adhered to going forward.

Max Garrick (UC Recruit Project Manager, UC Irvine) provided an update on new system enhancements in UC Recruit. All academic titles (including non-senate titles) are now using UC Recruit. In addition, demographic reports that track the number of women faculty, URM faculty, graduate students, and non-faculty on faculty search committees will be implemented. UC Recruit is currently being used by Irvine, San Diego, Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, and Santa Cruz. The remaining campuses will implement UC Recruit by July 1, 2013. In some instances, updated availability reports will replace some SED data with Association of American Medical Colleges (AMC) or Association of American Law Schools (AALS) data. UC Recruit will track possible reasons why applicants decline offers, including cost of living, childcare issues, elder care, and spousal/partner career opportunities. The tool will also track the effectiveness of advertising in reaching a diverse pool of applicants (e.g. in which publications the job listing appears; the language used in the job listing). Future goals for UC Recruit include tracking whether applicants meet basic qualifications for positions, documenting reasons why an applicant was/was not considered for further consideration, and enhanced compliance reporting with Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) categories.

Matt Xavier presented the results of the 2011-12 UC Faculty Search Data. Former UC Provost Lawrence Pitts mandated that faculty search committee data and new hires data be collected from UC campuses. Challenges during the first year of faculty search data collection included the variation of the collection methods that different campuses employed. Although the second year of data collection was better, refinements are still needed. Systemwide, the gender and race/ethnicity composition of faculty search committees somewhat matches the gender and race/ethncitiy composition of the faculty as a whole, as well as the STEM faculty subset. This result was consistent with the previous year as well. Data tables that showed applicant pools throughout the recruitment process revealed that "melt rates" across race/ethnicity lines (number of hires divided by the number of applicants) were comparable when data was aggregated at the systemwide level for all searches as well as for just STEM searches. However, further analysis is needed by campus to discover any trends at a disaggregated level. Two tables demonstrating how UC faculty composition compares to other institutions with regard to gender and race/ethnicity show that UC ranked second in each of these categories with the "Comparison 8" group (MIT, Harvard, Stanford, University of Illinois, University of Michigan, University of Virginia, State University of New York–Buffalo, Yale). Compared to another group of institutions from which UC hires faculty (known as "institution of highest degree" in the new hires database), UC ranked seventh for highest percentage of women faculty, and second for URM faculty and URM women faculty.

Kimberlee Shauman (Associate Professor of Sociology, Center for Poverty Research, UC Davis) facilitated the afternoon session. Attendees asked the following questions: Should we re-examine how availability

labor pools are defined or identified with regard to select fields or specialties? Should we conduct periodic trainings (e.g. every 3–5 years) at all campuses for search committees and those who vote on new hires? Should we look at data in deeper ways? Examples include:

• Examining the relationship between the pipeline pool and actual applicant pool

• Tracking the career placements of UC PhDs since over 20% of UCs faculty hires have UC degrees

• Examining the number of women faculty and URM faculty at the public and private institutions from which UC recruits