

# Summary Notes & Q+A

## Academic Meeting #3: Faculty Diversity

### Wednesday, April 10, 2019

Discussants: Judy Stepan-Norris, Doug Haynes, Diane O'Dowd

#### **Judy Stepan-Norris –Intro**

- Influx of 250 new FTE provides an opportunity to move the needle on diversity more quickly
- What strategies can we implement to ensure progress towards our goals?

#### **Doug Haynes (see slides)**

- UCI is unique among AAU universities in that we are growing our faculty
- URM faculty account for less than 10% of faculty
- We are enrolling more first generation and low-income students- HSI and AANAPISI campus- these attributes are unique among AAU campuses
- Base of faculty continues to grow, unless we increase URM hiring we won't see any change in percentage
- Female hires are closer to availability

#### **Diane O'Dowd (see slides)**

- Goal to reach 1500 faculty by 2021
- Last year we had a cumulative 108 net new faculty, not going as fast as we thought we would go, may take an additional 2 years to reach goal
- Big challenge on moving the needle- as of 18/19 we have 9.5% URM faculty and 37% female faculty
- Availability pool is also a major factor that must be considered- even if we are hiring to availability movement is still slow
- Campus is very committed to it but we must be intentional in many aspects
  - Generate applicant pools that reflect availability
  - Value contributions to inclusive excellence
  - Use of pipeline and development of pipeline and mentoring programs

#### **Q&A/Comments – Diversity Session (JSN- Judy Stepan-Norris DO: Diane O'Dowd, DH: Doug Haynes)**

#### **Questions/Topics**

**Question:** As for the needle, what is the goal? What do we want this institution to look like?

**DO:** As a public institution in California we would like to represent the population of the state.

Population of students is much closer than population of faculty. Ideally 28% URM, but if we even got to 12% I feel like we would be moving the needle.

**Question:** Given there is so much emphasis on faculty hiring, I'd hate to see the opportunity missed to focus on graduate student pipeline; we have an opportunity to encourage our URM students to pursue PhD's/academic track and increase the potential for a more diverse faculty profile in the future.

**DH:** We have been laser focused on diversifying the graduate student population; this year should yield our highest number of URM doctoral students; the campus this year doubled the number of fellowships and created a top off for newly admitted graduate students that completed a degree at a minority serving institution (CSU's, 2-year institutions); the campus is committed but why can we not hire our own graduate students? This is the exception to the rule. We need to increase PPF's and utilize that program better.

**Question:** Is it an unwritten rule to discourage the hiring of our own PhD's; Can we change that culture? Can a program to incentivize this hiring be implemented?

**DO:** You can encourage them to apply for PPF fellowships. There isn't a rule that we don't hire them but they have often been encouraged to go away from UCI to broaden their experience and sometimes they come back. Biological Sciences has hired a number of their PhD graduates but they have mostly been white males, recently they have hired 2 URMs.

**Question:** There are potential loopholes in the 'compelling' statement relating to contributions for diversity – it seems there are a number of ways to write a compelling statement but there can be no substance to them being successful in inclusive excellence.

**DO:** Discuss demonstrated commitment/competency. We have a group working on writing guidelines to help assess these types of statements. Faculty should define the types of things that have been done, talk about specific examples of programs/processes they have implemented to mentor these students into academia. There must be evidence that can be checked to confirm their commitment to inclusive excellence. Evaluation goes beyond the words and considers the actions. It's about what is done and the evidence provided to support it.

**Question:** Is the primary reason for the statements to get the inclusive excellence supplement? I don't think our school has ever applied for the supplement. Is there a way to share this information with the departments so they know what supplements are available and ways to evaluate?

**DO:** The Provost Leadership Academy subgroup has drafted guidelines for assessments of contributions for diversity and guidelines for the faculty to assess where they are and how they are achieving. Ways to measure what you are doing/should be doing at a particular stage in your career. There will be a series of examples for the different stages of career and should help consistency across the campus.

**Question:** Moving to the later stages of the job matching process. A successful hire culminates in an offer being made and accepted. The administration has told us a lot about the problem and the importance of doing this. What's missing is the part where the administration says do this and we have your back – when someone comes and they're outstanding, you can count on us to find the dollars to help match the competitors.

**DO:** If the Dean comes to central administration and makes the case, there has never been a time that administration hasn't supported the hire – if the dean puts up some money, central administration has done so historically as well. Administration will always work with the dean and match funds. This applies not only to URM but all faculty. We are always willing to work with the school.

**Question:** Why are offers being made and not landing?

**DO:** We need to look at the recruitment and ask questions about what happened during that recruitment? Was the applicant made to feel like this is somewhere they should come, will feel welcome – did they meet other faculty like them? Were they told they would get the setup they need?

**Question:** Exit interviews would be helpful and shed some interesting data. It could potentially help with retaining faculty.

**DH:** Exit interviews need to be done at the department levels because administration often doesn't know. What about working with our current URM faculty and asking them what's missing, what do we need? How can we be more attractive?

**Question:** We talked about inclusive excellence and diversity – what are we tangibly doing to make this an inclusive space? We can bring in women, women of color, faculty of color, URM's but it still not be an inclusive space. What are we doing to make it an inclusive space? What does the turnover look like over the years?

**DO:** We did a study about 5 years ago – for every 4 URM faculty, 3 would turnover – for every 4 female faculty, 2 would turnover. We now conduct climate surveys in schools and those results are looked at with the provost and deans; the deans are in a place of responsibility to take action. We do have some climate issues around types of casual gender harassment, and other cases of macroaggressions – I think part of this is due to the fact that if you have URM faculty that goes into a school where there are a number of one group, they then have to deal with it and they have to try and reconcile all the contradictions. We need to be more explicit and make it about inclusion, not just diversity. Inclusion requires a different set of actions and adjustments – you have to be self-aware and open to change. The provost takes appointments/re-appointments of deans very seriously and considers how they have monitored the climate. Faculty need to work together as colleagues and police themselves but this doesn't happen enough, particularly with gender harassment. Some schools now have climate councils and are dealing with local/internal issues. Nina Bandelj is our new Associate Vice Provost for faculty development with a big interest in developing programs/mentoring to help our assistant professors, faculty of color, women in STEM etc. to solicit the information about what is missing, where are the challenges? And how do we address those challenges?

**Question:** Is there any document on mentorship that is shouldered by existing faculty and how that mentorship is calculated?

**DO:** Ideas about team mentoring are coming out in the literature and promoted by the national academy of the sciences is a way to distribute that kind of activity into groups that will include all faculty, not just the minority groups, and each person addresses different aspects. It should distribute the burden a little bit. As far as credit for doing it, we are trying to move forward in a way that will talk about contributions not just to scholarly work but to other areas as well i.e. contributions to service and inclusive excellence so that faculty feel adequately rewarded.