USING RESEARCH AND DATA TO IMPROVE THE FACULTY SEARCH PROCESS

April 11, 2012

ADVANCE GRANT WORKSHOP
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Faculty Search Committee Members by Gender for Open STEM Positions in 2011

- Male: 74%
- Female: 26%

Source: UCOP Office of Academic Personnel 2012
University of California Systemwide STEM Faculty Search Process in 2011 by Gender by Stage

- **Applications**: 61.0% Male, 19.6% Female, 19.4% Unknown/not reported
- **Interviewees**: 59.4% Male, 22.1% Female, 22.7% Unknown/not reported
- **Hires**: 71.8% Male, 5.5% Female, 22.7% Unknown/not reported

Source: UCOP Office of Academic Personnel 2012
University of California Systemwide STEM Faculty Search Process in 2011 by Asian/White/Unknown Ethnicity by Stage

- Applicants:
  - Asian: 22.45%
  - White: 41.86%
  - Unknown/Not Reported: 30.53%

- Interviewees:
  - Asian: 31.48%
  - White: 38.89%
  - Unknown/Not Reported: 24.58%

- Hires:
  - Asian: 14.11%
  - White: 66.87%
  - Unknown/Not Reported: 12.88%

Source: UCOP Office of Academic Personnel 2012
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SYSTEMWIDE STEM FACULTY SEARCH PROCESS IN 2011 BY URM MINORITY ETHNICITY BY STAGE

- Amer.-Indian
- African-Amer.
- Hispanic

Applications: 3.87%, 1.11%, 0.17%
Interviewees: 4.04%, 0.67%, 0.34%
Hires: 4.91%, 0.61%, 0.61%

Source: UCOP Office of Academic Personnel 2012
Departmental Self Evaluation of Success at Hiring Women and Under Represented Minorities (URM)

Success at Hiring Women
- Excellent: 44%
- Good: 27%
- Fair: 17%
- Poor: 5%
- Missing: 7%

Success at Hiring URM
- Poor: 46%
- Fair: 24%
- Good: 12%
- Excellent: 8%
- Missing: 10%

N=59 Departments
Source: UC Berkeley Survey of Chairs 2006
**DEPARTMENTAL HIRING* OF WOMEN FACULTY (2000-2006) VS. WOMEN IN THE POOL**

*5+ hires

Source: UC Berkeley Survey of Chairs 2006
### Methods Used by Departments to Diversify Faculty Pool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Possible Methods Used to Enhance Pool</th>
<th>Self. Eval. Of Wom. Hire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exc. (n=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Listed faculty positions in multiple venues</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Job descrip. made clear wom./urm faculty encourg. to apply</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Made personal calls to enc. potential candidates to apply</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Selected diverse search committees</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Included graduate student input in search process</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Made calls to colleag. asking them to enc. wom./urm to apply</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Circulated job descr. among networks wom./urm educators</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Designated an affirmative action officer to serve on search</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Approached or interviewed applic. at professional meetings</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Established relation. with local/national women/URM org.</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Educated search committee members on div./equity/affirm.</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Discounted care-giving related resume gaps</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prioritized sub-disciplines w. high diversity</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Encouraged UC President's Postdoctoral Fellows to apply</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Interviewed candidates at a variety of conferences</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Yellow shading denotes p<.05 significant difference based on chi-square.

Note: Light Green shading denotes p<.10 significant difference based on chi-square.
**DEPARTMENTAL HIRING** of URM Faculty (2000-2006) vs. URM in the Pool

*Source: UC Berkeley Survey of Chairs 2006*

*5+ hires*
## Chair’s Ratings of the Usefulness of Possible Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Approaches</th>
<th>% chairs rating approach as useful</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offering guaranteed child-care slots</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establishing a centrally-funded relocation service/counselor to assist w. reloc. issues (e.g. housing, schools, partner hire)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offering a program to hire spouses/partners who are academics into 2-3 year temporary positions</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bringing potential candidates to campus for extended professional visits (e.g. to teach or do research)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prioritizing FTE requests that expand diversity or cross disciplinary research</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establishing a centrally-funded UCB recruitment service/specialist to help with the recruitment of women and URM</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Distributions Across Disciplines
OverSupply in the Applicant Pool Relative to Expected

### African American Women
- Theater/Dance – African American Perf
- African American Studies
- English – African American Lit
- Women’s Studies
- Education – Inequality
- Public Health – Health Disparities
- Music – African American Music
- Political Science – Diversity
- Sociology – Open
- Psychology - Clinical

### Hispanic Women
- Spanish – Latin American Lit
- Art History
- Education – Language
- History – Spanish American
- Women’s Studies
- Nutritional Sci
- Psychology – Social
- Boalt – Open
- Sociology - Open

### Asian Women
- History – South Asia
- Business
- Microbial Bio
- Psychology
- Public Health
- MCB
- Ag Econ
- Econ
- Women’s Studies
- Linguistics
- Tech Ed
EVALUATING RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

- Discuss the list of practices provided to your group.
- Rewrite/reword for clarity/purpose.
- Add new items to the list.
- Rate the strategies as to whether they should definitely, should possibly, or should not go on a survey of search chairs.