

University of California San Diego

Report of the Senate-Administration Workgroup on Faculty Recruitment

Committee Members:

Rommie Amaro, Ph. D.
Frances Contreras, Ph. D. (Co-chair)
Maripat Corr, M.D.
Jacqueline Daniel
Daniel Hallin, Ph. D. (Co-chair)
Cynthia Palmer
Mindy Schroeder, M. P. H.
Tamara Wall, Ph. D.

September 2019

Report of the Senate-Administration Workgroup on Faculty Recruitment

Overview

The Senate-Administration Workgroup on Faculty Recruitment was appointed in August 2018 and charged with "drafting a comprehensive faculty recruitment policy for Academic Appointments" (Appendix A). The Workgroup was co-chaired by Daniel C. Hallin, Professor of Communication and Frances Contreras, Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Recruitment and Retention and Associate Professor of Education Studies. The membership was comprised of faculty, administrators and staff from across the campus. The membership is listed in the charge letter in Appendix A, except that Asst. Dean Robert Rome resigned and Prof. Tamara Wall, from Psychiatry, replaced Emeritus Prof. Doris Trauner mid-way through the academic year.

After an investigation described below, the Workgroup concluded that there was indeed a need for a new formal campus policy on academic recruitment. The policy we have drafted is presented in Appendix B. The existing UC Systemwide policy, APM 500, approved as policy for the UC System in 2000, is limited in scope, and does not cover many key areas of policy which are typically covered in the recruitment policies of other campuses. Ours is the only campus which does not have such a policy. It was important to the committee to provide greater specificity for the campus on the issue of faculty recruitment. For example, we were surprised to learn that the campus had no written policy on search waivers. There are guidelines from the Office of the President on this subject, but these had never been incorporated into written campus policy reviewed by the Senate, and were being applied informally by the Office of Academic Recruitment Services.

The policy we are proposing does not represent a significant change from existing campus practices, although it does ratify some changes of policy that have been implemented over the past few years. It is not motivated by a belief that the recruitment system is in some way "broken" and needs to be fixed. Instead it is intended to formalize the policies we have been following, consistent with the principle of shared governance. The Draft Policy is, among other things, intended to reaffirm the principle that primary responsibility for recruitment lies with Department faculties, and to outline the processes of checks and balances that are intended to ensure that the process conforms with broader principles of excellence, fairness, transparency and diversity as well as ensuring compliance with legal obligations.

The Draft Policy is intended to apply to all positions carrying Senate membership, as well as HS Clinical and salaried Adjunct positions. It does not apply to other academic appointments, including Unit 18 Lecturers, post-doctoral fellows and Research and Project Scientists, some of which are covered by Collective bargaining agreements.

The Draft Policy, like those on other campuses, is quite general in character. The Workgroup was charged with examining a wide range of specific procedures the campus follows, and we did review these; they include such things as the constitution of search committees or the required content and procedures for reviewing Search Plans, Short Lists and Search Reports. We concluded, however, that these details should not be included in the formal policy, as more flexibility is needed in their application. We do, however, recommend that the Senate and the Administration discuss setting up a regular mechanism by which these procedures, and any changes that might be made to them, could be discussed.

The recruiting process is governed not only by formal policies and by procedures, but also by informal practices, and over the years all campuses have compiled sets of recommendations for best practices in faculty hiring which will promote campus goals of excellence, fairness and diversity. The Workgroup also decided that the campus would benefit from a review and a more comprehensive presentation of our promising practices guidelines. A subcommittee of the larger faculty recruitment policy workgroup and our proposed guidelines are presented in Appendix C. These guidelines are intended to be made available to search committees and other participants in the recruitment process, as part of the resources the campus provides to support that process.

Process of the Workgroup

The Workgroup met regularly starting in September 2018. We reviewed UC San Diego's written policies, procedures and guidelines, as well as those of all other UC campuses, reviewed documentation on the functioning of the search process at UC San Diego and solicited input from key participants in the process, including Department Chairs, Faculty Equity Advisors and administrators.

Findings

The academic recruitment process is intended to accomplish the goal of building an excellent and diverse faculty, and is guided by principles of fairness in the way applications are solicited and reviewed and of transparency befitting a public institution. The procedures are also structured to ensure compliance with applicable laws; the campus is subject to audits of the hiring process by Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP), as well as the Department of Labor, the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, Office for Civil Rights and US Department of Education, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The OFCCP has particular reporting requirements which are reflected in our procedures for search reports, and the campus has to be ready at any time to respond if one of these agencies requests documentation.

Primary responsibility for the recruitment process lies with Department faculties; at the same time our procedures incorporate a process of oversight and also advisory functions (in the form of the FEAs) that are intended to provide accountability and maintain compliance.

This process works well in general; the Workgroup believes it makes sense to reaffirm our commitment to it and to formalize its basic structure as campus policy. Our outreach to key stakeholders did not produce a large volume of complaints or calls for change. In many ways, we think there have been important improvements in recent years, and issues that might have called for change a few years ago have been addressed.

At the same time, there were a number of issues raised by participants in the process that should be noted and that require continuing attention.

One set of issues has to do with appointment files that are sent forward which involve minimal searches that are hard to justify under the University's obligation for open hiring. These issues have been addressed to some extent in recent years, and we hope that the statement of policy on when open searches are and are not required will provide clarity moving forward to avoid these issues.

Another concern commonly raised by Department Chairs and AP specialists has to do with the efficiency of the recruitment process and particularly with delays in approval of Search Plans, Short Lists and Search reports, which may delay the search or appointment process. This has been a central concern of departments for some time. Some progress does seem to have been made in addressing it. Changes were made to streamline the process in 2016, and data on turnaround times seem to confirm that they made a difference. From 2015/6 to 2017/8 average turnaround times for Search Plan approval declined from 10.1 to 5.7 days; for Short Lists from 8.9 to 6.3 days; for Search Reports from 11.5 to 6.0 days. Median times in 2017/8 were 5 days for Search Plans, and 4 days for Short Lists and Search Reports. We did not receive a heavy volume of complaints from Departments about this, as might have been the case a few years ago, and many of the cases that were cited turned out to be from a couple of years ago. There are, however, occasional cases where substantial delays take place, and it is worth continuing to scrutinize these cases and to clarify what can be done both by departments and by those involved in the review process to avoid them. The timing of FTE allocations is also a factor. Pressures to move the search process along rapidly are more intense when FTE are allocated relatively late, and the process therefore starts late.

Department Chairs and AP specialists also in some cases expressed concerns about what seemed to be inconsistent and shifting application of procedures, with Departments told different things by Deans' offices, for example, about procedures for search waivers, or changing policies on open-rank recruitments. Concerns were also sometimes expressed about modifications reviewers might ask in short lists, and whether these were justifiable. The existence of these kinds of concerns about the application of procedures is an important reason for our recommendation that there should be a forum in which these kinds of issues could be discussed on a regular basis.

Finally, concerns were expressed by a variety of different participants, including the Faculty Equity Advisors that department cultures in some cases continue to hinder effective progress toward more open hiring and a more diverse faculty. Addressing these issues is an important purpose of the structure we have in place--the reporting requirements, for example, the rules on search committee training, and the advisory role of the FEAs. The expanded guidelines we have produced are also intended to address it. It is an issue that is not easy to address and will require continued commitment.

Health Sciences

Recruitment in Health Sciences is particularly complex due to the large number of positions filled each year, the diversity of types of position, and the frequency of changes of series. One thing to note here is that while Health Sciences faculty have a diversity of different kinds of funding streams, this is in general not relevant to the University's legal obligations for open hiring: the OFCCP does not distinguish between searches based on whether the funding is state funding or private funding. The committee had substantial membership from Health Sciences, and we spent considerable time discussing the distinctive issues raised by Health Sciences hiring, particularly in relation to series changes, and reviewed the academic personnel policies for other UC campuses that include Health Sciences faculty, specifically UC Davis, UC Irvine, UC Los Angeles and UC San Francisco. Key provisions of these policies are summarized and links provided in Appendix D. Following the policies adopted at UC San Francisco and UC Los Angeles, the Draft Policy is constructed to reflect the following principles:

1. A change to ladder rank faculty requires an open, competitive search.
2. An exemption can be made for transfers from a non-Senate series to the In Residence or the Clinical X series, provided that the candidate was originally hired in an open search that included the senate series for which they are now being proposed (regardless of rank).

We believe that this policy provides Health Sciences with adequate flexibility while conforming to the principle of open searches.

Conclusion

In sum, the Senate-Administration Workgroup on Faculty Hiring makes three recommendations: first, that the campus formally adopt a policy of faculty recruitment, as presented in draft form in Appendix B; second, that the Senate and Administration discuss mechanisms for continued discussion of specific recruitment procedures that would give key participants in the process input on changes in policy and provide greater transparency in the reasons specific policies exist; and third, that the guidelines on Promising Practices presented in

Appendix C be made available to the campus community. If approved, existing departmental guidelines should be reviewed for adherence to the policy.

Appendix A

OVERVIEW AND GUIDING DOCUMENT

Workgroup Membership

Name	Title	Department/Division	Email
Frances Contreras (co-chair)	Associate Vice Chancellor of Faculty Recruitment and Retention / Professor	Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion / Education Studies	contrerasf@ucsd.edu
Daniel Hallin (co-chair)	Professor	Communication	dhallin@ucsd.edu
Doris Trauner	Professor Emeritus	Neurosciences	dtrauner@ucsd.edu
Rommie Amaro	Professor	Chemistry & Biochemistry	ramaro@ucsd.edu
Mary Pat Corr	Professor	Medicine	mpcorr@ucsd.edu
Cindy Palmer	Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel Services	Academic Affairs	c5palmer@ucsd.edu
Robert Rome	Assistant Dean	Physical Sciences	rrome@ucsd.edu
Mindy Schroeder	Academic Personnel Manager	Jacobs School of Engineering	mschroeder@ucsd.edu
Jacqueline Daniel	Sr. Academic Recruitment Analyst	Health Sciences	jdaniel@ucsd.edu

Purpose of the Workgroup

What is the Workgroup expected to accomplish?

The workgroup is charged with drafting a comprehensive faculty recruitment policy for academic appointments at UC San Diego that streamlines and improves current practices, while supporting our institutional goals for excellence and diversity. The policy should accomplish the following:

- 1) Specify the requirements and procedures for recruiting academic personnel, from establishing a new academic appointment to extending an offer, including special hiring mechanisms, such as dual academic career appointments, excellence searches, targets of opportunity, cluster hires, and waivers.
- 2) Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of Search Committee Chairs, Department Chairs, Faculty Equity Advisors, Deans, and OARS staff throughout the search process.

- 3) Clearly define requirements for search committees, including implicit bias training and procedures for establishing selection criteria, evaluating candidates, establishing long and short lists of candidates, voting, and inviting candidates for campus interviews.

Guiding Questions

- *Do current policies and procedures adequately address the breadth of recruitment needs and practices?*
- *Are recruitment policies and procedures communicated clearly and are they easily accessible?*
- *Are the policies applied uniformly? What are the differences between general campus and health sciences, and/or between divisions?*
- *How do our faculty recruitment policies compare with the policies at other UC campuses?*
- *Do policies and procedures allow sufficient flexibility in unusual or exceptional cases?*
- *What are the strengths of current policies and practices*
- *Are there any bottlenecks, inefficiencies, or inconsistencies that should be addressed?*
- *Are there any best practices or alternative strategies that would improve the recruitment process?*

Current Policies and Procedures

What are the systemwide and campus policies and procedures regarding faculty recruitment?

UC Academic Personnel Policies and Guidance on Recruiting Academic Personnel

- APM 500, General Recruitment: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-500.pdf>
- APM 501, From Other California Institutions: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-501.pdf>
- APM 510, Intercampus Transfers: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-510.pdf>
- APM 520, Employment of Near Relatives: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-520.pdf>
- APM 530, Noncitizens: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-530.pdf>
- APM 540, Travel Expenses: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-540.pdf>
- APM 550, Moving Expenses for Intercampus Transfers: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-550.pdf>
- APM 560, Removal Expenses/General: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-560.pdf>
- APM 561, Removal Expenses/Assistants: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-561.pdf>
- APM 570, Travel Expenses for Short-Term Appointees on Extramurally Financed Projects: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-570.pdf>

- APM 200, Appointment and Promotion, General: <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-200.pdf>

UC Policy on Discrimination, Harassment, and Affirmative Action in the Workplace

<https://policy.ucop.edu/doc/4000376/DiscHarassAffirmAction>

<https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-035.pdf>

UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment

<https://policy.ucop.edu/doc/4000385/SVSH>

Guidance on Evaluating Contributions to Diversity for Faculty Appointment and Promotion Under APM – 210

<https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/policies-guidelines/eval-contributions-diversity.pdf>

Guidance for Addressing Race and Gender Equity in Academic Programs in Compliance with Proposition 209

<https://www.ucop.edu/general-counsel/files/guidelines-equity.pdf>

Faculty Recruitment Policies and Procedures at UC Campuses

UC San Diego: <https://aps.ucsd.edu/recruitment/index.html>

UC Berkeley: <https://ofew.berkeley.edu/recruitment>

UC Los Angeles: <https://apo.ucla.edu/policies-forms/the-call/appendices/appendix-23-faculty-search-guidelines>

<https://apo.ucla.edu/policies-forms/the-call/appendices/appendix-22-summary-of-recruitment-policy>

UC Santa Barbara:

https://ap.ucsb.edu/policies.and.procedures/red.binder/sections/%5B7_01%5D%20Policies%20on%20Open%20Recruitment.pdf

UC Riverside: http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/policies_and_procedures/

http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/checklists_and_forms/appointment_forms/Academic%20Recruitment%20Process.pdf

UC Santa Cruz: <https://apo.ucsc.edu/policy/capm/100.500%20.html>

Appendix B

Draft Policy on Open Recruitment for Academic Positions

Open recruitment for academic positions ensures the broadest and most diverse pools, which promotes excellence in faculty hiring, as well as fairness and transparency in the hiring process. It is the policy of the University of California not to engage in discrimination against any person seeking employment with the University. In addition, it is the policy of the University to undertake affirmative action, consistent with its obligations as a Federal contractor. Conducting open searches for employment positions supports the University of California in fulfilling its compliance requirements under federal and state laws. The University of California Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty, Office of the President, Academic Advancement, are available through the UC Office of the President at: <https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/policies-guidelines/affirmative.pdf> and APM 500 (<https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/apm/apm-500.pdf>).

An initial open recruitment is required for all appointments to positions carrying Academic Senate membership, as well as to positions in the HS-Clinical and salaried Adjunct series, unless the recruitment is exempt, or a search waiver has been granted under specific criteria listed in sections II and III below.

I. Recruitment Process Responsibilities

Primary responsibility for the conduct of searches lies with Department Chairs and with search committees appointed by them, except in the case of certain joint searches.

- The Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) establishes specific requirements for the conduct of open searches, and reviews requests for search waivers.
- Divisional Deans and Vice Chancellors (SIO, Health Sciences) authorize the initiation of searches, and have final approval authority for the conduct of searches at each stage of the process.
- Faculty Equity Advisors (FEAs) review department searches for equity and transparency and advise Deans and Chairs on the search process. Departments are encouraged to confer with FEAs on search processes and to review best practices. FEAs also conduct the required search trainings, including implicit bias, across Departments/Search Committees. For a more detailed description of best practices please see the Center for Faculty Diversity & Inclusion website: <https://facultydiversity.ucsd.edu/>.
- Office of Academic Recruitment Services (OARS) reviews recruitments for compliance with federal and state laws, with UC policy, and with local UC San Diego policy.

All of these actors share responsibility for insuring compliance with federal and state laws, fair treatment of all applicants, transparency of the search process and broad applicant pools that will lead to the recruitment of an excellent and diverse faculty.

II. Exemption from Open Recruitment Policies

A series change from one Senate series to another (e.g. Teaching Professor to ladder rank faculty) or from one non-senate series to another (e.g. HS-Clinical to salaried Adjunct), or from a Senate series to a non-senate series is exempt from an open search, as long as the initial appointment had either an open search or a waiver approved under the criteria in section III.

Transfers from a non-Senate to a Senate series are not exempt, and require open searches. However, a Transfer (series change) from non-Senate (e.g., Salaried Adjunct, or Health Sciences Clinical) to a Senate Faculty position (e.g. In Residence, or Clinical X) may be exempt from an open search if the candidate was originally appointed after an open search which included the Senate series that the candidate is now being proposed (regardless of rank). In specific cases the change in series may be processed without conducting a new search.

In addition, appointees to academic positions listed below are exempt from open recruitment and do not require waiver requests. These include:

- Non-Salaried (0% time) and Without Salary (WOS) Appointments for:
 - Volunteer Clinical Faculty
 - WOS non-senate faculty (e.g., HS Clinical, Adjunct) who do not receive pay from a UC affiliate
 - WOS non-faculty academic (e.g. Professional Research Series)
 - Research Associate (WOS)
 - Clinical Associate (WOS)
 - Research Fellow (WOS)
 - Visiting Scholar/Visiting Titles (WOS)
- True Visitor: A temporary visiting appointee who is on leave from an academic or research position at another educational institution
- Lecturer in Summer Session: Faculty holding appointments in the associated department during the previous or following academic year and campus graduate students are exempt from recruitment requirements for assignment to Summer Session instruction. Individuals who do not hold a faculty appointment or graduate student status are subject to open search or waiver requirements.

III. Search Waivers

The university is committed to open and transparent search processes. However, there are certain circumstances that may warrant a search waiver to an open recruitment. Waivers made under these criteria are not time limited. Departments may request waivers of the open search requirement under the following circumstances:

A. Spousal/Partner Hire: The University of California recognizes that addressing the needs of dual career couples is an essential part of recruiting and retaining the highest quality faculty. A search waiver may be considered by the Executive Vice Chancellor if the successful recruitment or retention of a faculty member is dependent on an academic appointment for their spouse/partner. Every spouse/partner hire must meet the qualifications and standard of

excellence for the appropriate appointment. A spouse/partner hire is contingent on ultimate employment or retention of the associated individual confirming acceptance. This search waiver must list the JPF associated with the recruitment under which the principal partner/spouse is being considered and is of indefinite duration.

B. Exceptional opportunity: An unusual opportunity to hire an individual who has qualifications that are so uniquely outstanding as to justify the waiver. In all these cases the candidate would be on the short list of top candidates if an open search were conducted, and the individual would be highly sought after by peer institutions. The candidate also offers an opportunity to diversify the faculty within a Department through the record of scholarship and impact they bring to UC San Diego. Examples would include an internationally recognized leader in a particular field (e.g. a Nobel Laureate or a Pulitzer Prize winner), an exceptional scholar who would make special contributions to diversity in a particular program or field, or a highly sought-after individual who is on the market for a very limited period of time. Exceptional Opportunity hires are normally expected to be for Academic Senate titles at the Full or Associate Professor level, but under some circumstances justified by compelling reasons, they may be at the Assistant level.

C. President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP)/Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellowship recipients: The candidate is a current or former recipient of a UC President's or Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellowship, and eligible for appointment under the current program guidelines.

Consistency with the above requirements does not guarantee that a waiver will be granted.

IV. Excellence Search

A Dean may also decide to initiate a "Target of Excellence Search" within a Department. In general, an Excellence search places additional emphasis on the diversity statement and is monitored by Department Chairs in partnership with the Faculty Equity Advisors and Associate Vice Chancellor's for Equity Diversity and Inclusion.

V. Level of Appointment

Generally, appointment level is limited to the tenure track or tenured level of the advertised recruitment. However, in rare cases, recruitments advertised at the Assistant or Associate Professor level, may warrant consideration of a higher rank if the candidate was promoted at their home institution while the search is in progress, or if an appointment at higher rank is justified by the need to make a competitive recruitment offer (e.g. by a competing offer at a higher rank). In these cases:

1. The department must confirm FTE availability of a higher rank with their Dean;
2. A higher rank appointment is only determined through academic review, i.e. departments are limited to proposing appointment at the advertised rank but may suggest that reviewers consider appointing at a higher level.

Departments and Deans should consult with Academic Personnel Services before suggesting that reviewers consider recruitment at a rank higher than advertised.

Appendix C



**Promising Practices
for Diversifying the
Faculty at UC San
Diego**

August 2019

Promising Practices for Diversifying the Faculty at UC San Diego

Search practices that promote the hiring of diverse faculty are an important element of fulfilling the mission of the University of California, as a public system of higher education in the state. To this end, faculty within UC San Diego, have the unique privilege of creating academic departments that will serve their respective fields as well as the undergraduate and graduate student bodies that attend the university. The Faculty Recruitment Policy work group engaged in a process during the 2018-2019 academic year to develop a faculty recruitment policy. As an adjunct to the policy these promising practices and resources for diversifying the faculty at UC San Diego were developed and will be updated regularly by the Center for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion.

Context for Diversity in California and the UC System

Nationally, U.S. college students are four times as likely than faculty to be Latinx, and twice as likely than faculty to be African American (Davis & Fry, 2019). In California, six out of nine undergraduate degree granting UC campuses are Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), and two campuses, UC San Diego and UC Los Angeles, are Emerging HSIs (Contreras, 2018). And the largest proportion of applicants to UC San Diego and the UC System are now students of color. It is therefore critical for public systems and institutions of higher education to recruit and retain diverse faculty to better reflect the statewide population, and foster inclusive campus climates.

Turner (2002), in “Diversifying the Faculty: A Guidebook for Search Committees” explains the important role that faculty diversity has on educational quality and the educational outcomes of all students. Therefore, to serve all students well, greater faculty diversity remains a goal across research institutions in the U.S. and at UC San Diego. The following strategies offer select promising practices for a) the search process, b) departmental strategies and c) campus strategies for Deans, Department Chairs, and Search Chairs as they work to promote greater levels of faculty diversity with their respective academic units and departments at UC San Diego.

This document provides information regarding:

- A. The Search Process
- B. Department Strategies
- C. Campus Strategies
- D. Additional Resources

- 1. Consult with Faculty Equity Advisors (FEAs) in your Department.** Faculty equity advisors are senior faculty across multiple academic divisions and units on campus. FEAs have a track record of promoting equity and diversity within their academic units, as well as knowledge of promising equitable practices in searches. They conduct the implicit bias/search trainings for faculty search committees and offer early consultation with Deans and Chairs who are planning searches. The FEAs also serve in a formal capacity in the search process, approving search plans, and long and short candidate selection lists of individual searches. FEAs are a valuable resource for promoting best practices in faculty hiring on the UC San Diego Campus. For a detailed summary of the FEA role, please see the following link: <https://facultydiversity.ucsd.edu/fea/index.html>
- 2. Ensure Transparent Search Processes.** At the start of each search, reviewing the job description to ensure it is inclusive is essential to welcoming a broad pool of candidates. A job description should be broad enough to attract a competitive pool from national and international institutions. Applicants should be provided with a clear understanding of the position (and requirements for consideration) through the posted job description, and the search committee should refrain from creating alternate standards/criterion for specific candidates.
- 3. Appoint search committee members and a chair that value diversity, are courageous and respected.** Search committees should be diverse, with content expertise, and possess the shared value and mission of this public institution. A committee that values diversity and promotes equitable search practices is key to successful searches and greater faculty diversity.
- 4. Ensure that every faculty member on the search committee attends search/implicit bias training by their FEA.** Attending search training is a requirement at UC San Diego in order to participate on a Search Committee. Department leaders can help to ensure that every member of search committees attend these important training sessions led by Department FEAs or the AVCs for Equity, Diversity & Inclusion.
- 5. Incorporate diversity statements into candidate discussions and selection.** Diversity statements are part of the application process. They are required and are intended gain a better understanding of a candidate's background and tangible efforts to promote diversity. Incorporating diversity statements into the discussion of long and short list candidates may assist search committees in identifying a more diverse pool of finalists.
- 6. Engage in active & personal recruitment.** Search Committee members and faculty within Departments should actively search out diverse candidates. Personally calling, emailing and

asking Deans, Chairs and leading faculty in the field may lead to a more robust pool of diverse candidates.

7. **Utilize existing databases of diverse early career scholars to seek out candidates for positions.** This strategy requires early planning and permission by the entity or organization that owns the rights to these databases. Examples of databases of early career scholars include: FORD Fellow databases, PFPF databases, SACNAS databases, the NSF and NIH early career awardees, and K-2 grants awardees.

B

Department Strategies

1. **Comprehensive diverse hiring plan.** Increasing diversity within departments calls for tangible effort and planning given the competitive nature of recruiting highly competitive emerging and established scholars of color. Every Department should be engaging in regular discussions about their plan for hiring more diverse faculty. Developing a comprehensive hiring plan that delineates efforts to recruit more diverse faculty that is developed in conjunction with department faculty would help to foster greater ownership for diversity hiring priorities within the department (Williams, 2013).
2. **Cluster hiring.** Cluster hires have been used by sister campuses to hire faculty across divisions in areas to foster a culture of interdisciplinary engagement across Departments and greater collaboration. In addition, bringing in faculty of color alongside other diverse hires helps to foster community and a critical mass of support (Smith et al., 2004) as they navigate the campus and the merit process.
3. **Visiting faculty, speaker series, faculty fellows.** Introducing department faculty to leading faculty of color in the field is an important step to engaging them in scholarship that may be different from their own. It also provides an opportunity to make a good impression on the visiting faculty and build the department's reputation as a place that values diversity and equity. Leading faculty of color may also have mentees and colleagues and can help to promote your department or offer names for future positions.
4. **Mentoring PFPF scholars/Chancellor's Associates.** The UC President's Postdoctoral program provides an excellent opportunity for UC San Diego faculty to mentor highly competitive diverse early career scholars. Applying to mentor a recent Ph.D. graduate is a promising approach for integrating Postdoctoral fellows to the campus and transitioning them to tenure track positions. <https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/files/ppfp-brochure-optimized.pdf>
5. **Cost sharing to support PFPF scholars with EDI.** Departments may wish to cost share with EDI to support a Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellow, which enables the Postdoctoral scholar

the same hiring benefit as PFP scholars. The faculty mentor has the option of providing resources to support their postdoctoral fellow and negotiate a level of resources (e.g., travel, technology resources, etc.) from the Center for Faculty Diversity & Inclusion.

6. **Hiring PFP scholars.** The UC President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship program is a model system-wide program across UC. Hiring PFP scholars that are conducting research at UC San Diego should be a priority of Departments hosting these scholars.
7. **Target of Opportunity Hires.** Consider Target of Opportunity hires for candidates that offer an exceptional academic record and would elevate departmental diversity. When qualified candidates are in the pool of finalists, initiating a target of opportunity hire is a qualified approach to hire a diverse and equally strong candidate.
8. **Encourage all faculty beyond search committee members to attend a search committee training by the FEA or one of the Associate Vice Chancellors.** Having all faculty engage in implicit bias training may help departmental climates to collectively address and recognize bias in search processes.

C

Campus Strategies

1. **Diverse Faculty Hiring Initiatives.** Many public and private universities have established diverse hiring initiatives that help to recruit leading faculty of color in their respective fields. These initiatives earmark funding for endowed chairs, visiting faculty, key speakers series, and resources for transition (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).
2. **A Strong Focus on Institutional Climate.** There is no better recruitment tool than faculty who are content within their academic departments and thriving in their respective fields. Fostering equitable department climates and a healthy institutional climate helps to build a culture of inclusivity and equity.
3. **Climate Survey and Assessments.** Studying the various data elements from climate surveys and assessments administered for the campus (faculty and staff surveys, as well as UCUES) is important to understand how departments fare, as well as how students, staff and faculty perceive their work climate. These assessments are important to implement regularly to ensure the campus develops strategies that foster inclusivity and are responsive to any challenges experienced by select stakeholder groups.
4. **Strong Faculty Networks.** UC San Diego has a Faculty of Color Network, a Women’s Network, First Generation Faculty network, an LGBTQ Faculty Network, and is working to develop a Male Ally Network. Such networks help to promote community, while also providing the opportunity for engagement, organic mentorship relationships to form, and

exposure to thought provoking sessions as well as professional development for faculty at all stages of their academic careers. For more information on the faculty networks through EDI, please see: <http://facultydiversity.ucsd.edu/development/index.html#Faculty-Networks->

5. **Strategic Plan for Inclusive Excellence at UC San Diego.** Familiarizing the search committee and department leaders with this campus effort and strategic plan may assist departments in recruiting faculty of color. <https://diversity.ucsd.edu/initiatives/strategic-plan.html>

D	Additional Resources
----------	-----------------------------

Brown-Glaude, W. (2009). *Doing Diversity in Higher Education*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Chun, E. & A. Evans. 2015. *The Department Chair as Transformative Diversity Leader: Building Inclusive Learning Environments in Higher Education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Fine, E. & J. Handelsman. 2012. *Searching for Excellence & Diversity: A Guide for Search Committees*. National Edition. Madison, WI: Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute.

Leslie, S.-J.; A. Cimpian, M. Meyer & E. Freeland. 2015. Expectations of brilliance underlie gender distributions across academic disciplines. *Science* 347(6219):262-265.

Madera, J. M., M. R. Hebl, and R. C. Martin. "Gender and Letters of Recommendation for Academia: Agentive and Communal Differences." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94, no. 6 (2009): 1591–1599.

Moody, J. 2012. *Faculty Diversity: Removing the Barriers*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, D., Turner, C., Osei-Kofi, N., Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the Usual: Successful Strategies for Hiring Diverse Faculty, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75:2, 133-160, DOI: [10.1080/00221546.2004.11778900](https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2004.11778900)

Turner, C. (2002). *Diversifying the Faculty: A Guidebook for Search Committees*. Publication of the American Association of Colleges & Universities.

UC Office of the President System-wide Efforts:
<https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/systemwide-efforts/index.html>

UC Campus Efforts:

<https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/campus-efforts/index.html>

U.S. Department of Education (2016). Promising Practices in Faculty Diversity. Download at:

<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/advancing-diversity-inclusion.pdf>.

Williams, D. (2013). *Strategic Diversity Leadership*. New York: Stylus Publishing. Appendix D

Summary of Policies on Health Sciences Hiring at Other UC Campuses

UCSF

A transfer in series for a non-senate to a senate position does require an open search except if the original search included the senate series for which they are now being proposed (regardless of rank), the change in series may be processed without conducting a new search and instead an indefinite search waiver may be processed by the VPAA (academic recruitment specialist). (<https://academicaffairs.ucsf.edu/academic-personnel/recruitment-retention/media/Search%20&%20Search%20Waiver%20Policy.pdf>)

UC Davis

Certain exemptions for internal hires to a Senate series may apply. Note that this exemption does not preclude a search for appointment to any academic series when required by the University or campus. Rather, it acknowledges that an exemption may be applied when the change in series is intended to recognize growth and development in professional skills, knowledge, and responsibility of the appointee. All initial appointments in the senate series require a search or a search waiver. Exemptions may apply for certain changes or transfers in series. As footnotes to this section detail, some (but not all) of these transfers are explicitly discussed in APM policy. In these cases, the Chancellor's authority to grant exceptions can allow for the exemptions.

<https://aadocs.ucdavis.edu/policies/recruitments-and-removals/search-waiver-and-exemption-guidelines.pdf>

UCLA

Search requirements are waived for appointments to the Regular Professor Series if the individual is transferring from an appointment in a different series, where the original appointment was made in expectation of the transfer, and the search undertaken at the time of the original appointment was equivalent in character and scope that would have been required at the time for the position to which the transfer was contemplated.

<https://www.apo.ucla.edu/policies-forms/the-call/appendices/appendix-23-faculty-search-guidelines>

UC Irvine

Exemption for Internal Hires (Change in Series): Note that this exemption does not preclude a search for appointment to any academic series when required by the University or campus. Rather, it acknowledges that an exemption may be applied when the change in series is intended to recognize growth and development in professional skills, knowledge, and responsibility of the appointee. All initial appointments in the senate series require a search or a search waiver. Exemptions may apply for certain changes or transfers in series. As footnotes to this section detail, some (but not all) of these transfers are explicitly discussed in APM policy. In these cases, the Chancellor's authority to grant exceptions can allow for the exemptions.

<https://ap.uci.edu/exemptionguidelines/>