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UCLA Faculty Search Committee Briefings

- Began in 2007.
- More than 730 faculty members have attended a Faculty Search Committee Briefing, most in Regular Rank.
- At UCLA, the search chair and one other member of the committee is required to attend a briefing.
- 2 hour long briefings, with lunch or breakfast provided, or 1 to 1.5 hour local meetings for search committees or departments.
Faculty Attending Briefing 2007-2012 by School/Division

- Attendees
- Regular Faculty 2012

Bar chart showing attendees and regular faculty for various schools/divisions from 2007 to 2012.
Goals for Today’s Presentation

- Provide an overview of the UCLA Faculty Search Committee Briefing
- Explain the rationale for the design of the briefing – what has worked
- Review some of the research on Schemas, Stereotypes & Unconscious Bias
Key Points In Faculty Search Briefing

- **Data** on Faculty Demographics: UCLA & Systemwide
- **Research**: Schemas, Stereotypes & Unconscious Bias
- **Legal Issues**: Affirmative Action & Prop 209
- **Roles** of Search Committee & Search Chair
- **Best Practices** for More Equitable Evaluation
2009 UC Faculty Headcount by Race/Ethnicity and Field
Representation varies by field (Grand total= 9,647)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Nat Am</th>
<th>Afr Am</th>
<th>Chic/Lat</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Hum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc Sci/Psych</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engi/CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Sci/Math</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sci</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2009 UC Faculty Headcount by Gender and Field

Representation varies by field (Grand total = 9,647)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Hum</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc Sci/Psych</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engi/CS</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Sci/Math</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sci</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The State of Diversity at UCLA
Fall 2012 Data

UCLA Ladder Rank Faculty
- Women, 29.3%
- Men, 70.7%

UCLA Graduate Students
- Men, 54.2%
- Women, 45.8%

UCLA Undergraduate Students
- Men, 45.2%
- Women, 54.8%

UCLA Graduate Students
- Native Am, 0.53%
- International, 19.3%
- Unknown, 8.4%
- African Am, 4.1%
- Asian/Pacific Islander, 21.3%
- White, 37.5%
- Hispanic, 8.7%

UCLA Undergraduate Students
- Native Am, 3.9%
- African Am, 3.5%
- International, 10.4%
- Unknown, 3.4%
- Asian/Pacific Islander, 3.5%
- White, 29%
- Hispanic, 17.2%

UCLA Ladder Rank Faculty
- Unknown, 0.2%
- African Am, 3.5%
- Asian, 16.6%
- Hispanic, 6.3%
- Native Am, 0.5%
- White, 73%
Unconscious Bias & Use of Schemas

Purpose

• Increase awareness of unconscious bias

• Consider how unconscious bias may play a role in how you **evaluate** a student, how you **mentor** colleagues and students, what words you use in a letter of recommendation, and how you **select** new faculty

*Adapted in part from presentation developed by NSF ADVANCE Project at the University of Michigan (a project to increase the advancement of women faculty in the sciences)*
What is a Schema?

“Schemas are hypotheses that we use to interpret social events. They are similar to stereotypes, but the term schema is more inclusive and more neutral.”

“Gender schemas are hypotheses about what it means to be male or female – hypotheses that we share, male and female alike.”

Schemas Affect Evaluation
When auditioners were behind a screen, the percentage of female new hires for orchestral jobs increased 25 – 46%.

2. Evaluation of CVs

When evaluating identical application packages, male and female University psychology professors preferred hiring “Brian” over “Karen” by 2:1 ratio.

3. Letters of Recommendation

Differences in Letters of Recommendation:

Letters for men had more references to CV, publications, patients, and colleagues

Letters for women
- Were shorter
- Contained more “doubt raisers” (hedges, faint praise, and irrelevancies)
- Had more references to personal life

Examples:
“*It’s amazing how much she’s accomplished.*”
“*She has a rather challenging personality.*”
“*She excelled in every task she chose to take on.*”

4. Interview Calls for Jobs

- “White” names received 50% more calls for interviews than “African-American” names.

- For “White” names, a higher quality resume elicited 30% more calls.

- For “African-American” names, the increase was only 9% for a higher quality resume.

5. Evaluation of Fellowship Applications

• Peer reviewers gave female applicants lower scores than male applicants who displayed the same level of scientific productivity.

• Women applying for the postdoctoral fellowship had to be 2.5 times more productive to receive the same reviewer rating as the average male applicant.

6. Education vs. Experience: Which is More Valuable?

**Shifting Standards**

*Male applicants were shown preference*

- If male had more education, *then education* was valued over experience, and 75% picked the male.

- If female had more education, *then experience* was valued over education and only 43% picked the female.

When evaluating identical applications:

- Evaluators rated mothers as less competent and committed to paid work than nonmothers.
- Mothers were less likely to be recommended for hire, promotion, and management, and were offered lower starting salaries than nonmothers.
- Prospective employers called mothers back about half as often as nonmothers.

When evaluating identical applications:

- Fathers were seen as *more* committed to paid work and offered *higher* starting salaries than nonfathers.

- Fathers were not disadvantaged in the hiring process.

• 36% of full-time faculty have academic partners.

• 83% of women scientists in academic couples are partnered with another scientist.

• 72% of full time faculty have employed partners whose careers need to be taken into consideration when recruiting.

Obstacles to Diversification: A Self Reinforcing Cycle

1. Evaluation bias
   - Overuse of Schemas
   - Lack of critical mass

2. Lowered Success Rate
   - Accumulation of disadvantage
   - Performance is underestimated
Legal Issues
Which of the following are TRUE?

1. The Federal government reviews hiring practices for affirmative action and equal opportunity employment.
3. As a Federal contractor, UCLA is required to gather demographic data on all job applicants.
4. UCLA’s goal is to have its workforce reflect the availability of diverse populations within each field.
5. The department chair & dean approve each applicant pool and the smaller selection pool to ensure they are broad and inclusive.
For federal contractors and subcontractors, **affirmative action must be taken** by covered employers to recruit and advance qualified minorities, women, persons with disabilities, and covered veterans.

**Prop 209**

Proposition 209 is a California State Law implemented in 1997 that states that **no preferential treatment** can be given during the hiring process based on race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin.
Although the University may not consider an individual’s race, ethnicity or gender as a component in selection for a faculty Appointment...

You can consider:

**Academic values that support a diverse learning environment**

- A record of teaching, research or service that will contribute to the diversity of the campus
- Mentoring and outreach activities
Responsibilities of Search Committee Members

- Actively search for candidates
- Carefully review and assess files
- Welcome all candidates with equal respect & courtesy
- Maintain confidentiality
- Member who assumes responsibility for Affirmative Action – monitor activities of committee for equity, broaden search for inclusivity
Responsibilities of the Search Committee Chair

• Ensure compliance with legal and policy requirements
  – Broad & inclusive search
  – Evaluative consistency & fairness
  – Confidentiality & records retention

• Ongoing contact with candidates

• Establish committee processes and ground rules
  – Job advertisement & recruitment strategy
  – Evaluation criteria
Deciding How to Decide

- Establish Ground Rules First
- Rules of Discussion
- Consistency
- Processes
- Hold One Last Meeting
Which of the following help to “broaden” a search?

a) Wording in ad that highlights interest in diversity

b) Recruiting through targeted professional organizations

c) Asking colleagues to recommend women and minority candidates & others

d) Widening the range of institutions from which you recruit

e) Utilizing a diverse search committee (demographics & field)
More Equitable Evaluation of Candidates

• Stick to Agreed Upon Criteria & Process
• Maintain consistency: job ad, interview questions, evaluation criteria
• Calibrate your committee
• Slow Down & Self-Correct
• Do Not Rank Order Immediately
• Develop Multiple Lists
• Insist on Evidence
Which of the following questions are LEGAL in a job interview?

a. Where were you born?
b. What church do you attend?
c. Have you ever been treated for an illness?
d. How old are you?
e. What is your experience mentoring diverse students?
f. Are you married?
g. Do you have any children?
h. What does your partner do for a living?
The Fallacy of Crystal Ball Gazing
Choosing from the “Best of the Best”? 

The Pool of

Gender Schemas

Race & Ethnicity Schemas

How do you define “best”?