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Overview

The University Leadership Council's report, *Breakthrough Advances in Faculty Diversity* (2008), asserts that despite very real challenges nationwide that make a broad diversification of faculty across higher education unlikely in the near future, individual institutions can be successful in their efforts to increase their percentage of faculty from underrepresented groups. And while most believe that "deep pockets" and geography are the key factors impacting faculty recruitment, the ULC has found that "a significant amount of the variation in faculty diversity [across institutions] results from individual university effort and practice—strategies that can be replicated at other universities" (xvi).

At Stonehill conversations about building greater diversity amongst our faculty have been going on for over a decade, and while we have made some progress in this area, we lack the campus-wide coordination necessary to effectively focus our "effort and practice" in ways that will lead to sustainable change. In response to this need, the Provost's Advisory Committee on Diversity was charged in August 2012 with investigating how Stonehill might be more intentional in its efforts to build a diverse faculty. The following report summarizes our findings and makes recommendations for concrete steps the College can take in the coming years to improve our hiring efforts.

Although our report focuses specifically on the diversification of our faculty, we recognize that these efforts cannot succeed on their own. They must be undertaken in conjunction with steps to 1) increase diversity among students and staff, 2) develop a curriculum that reflects the diverse range of human experiences, 3) create inclusive and welcoming classroom environments, and 4) build a campus climate that supports the entire campus community. We urge continued cross-divisional conversation and collaboration in all these areas so that we can develop Stonehill into a model for institutional diversity and inclusion.

Grounding Assumptions

Diversity Drives Academic Excellence

Although the committee's work is certainly driven by the social justice implications of our disproportionately white campus community, we are also committed to the belief that academic excellence requires a diverse environment in which to thrive. For example, like most faculty at Stonehill, we recognize the benefit to our students' education—as well as our own fulfillment as educators—that comes from having a more diverse student body. Not only because our students are entering an increasingly multicultural workforce but also because of the intellectual challenge that comes from confronting various perspectives in the classroom, a more diverse student body translates into a better education for our students. We also believe that a necessary step in building a more diverse student body is building a more diverse faculty. We are more likely to recruit students to our campus if they see themselves reflected in the staff and faculty with whom they will be working.

However, in our conversations with faculty regarding this effort, it hasn’t been unusual to encounter attitudes such as: “Yes, I’m in full support of increasing the diversity of our faculty, but only if it doesn’t diminish the quality of our programs.” This tendency to see diversity and excellence as competing—rather than complementary, or even interdependent—goals can undermine our ability to achieve either. In fact, diversity is already a key element of how we have traditionally defined “excellence” in the academy: a strong department is one which encompasses a
variety of intellectual approaches and specialties. A department whose faculty all share the same area of expertise or who were all trained in the same graduate program would be considered to have too narrow a focus. Even a generational imbalance (i.e. a department with a disproportionately small number of assistant or full professors) may mark a department as weaker than one which has a more even distribution of faculty experience levels. It is in line with this same logic, then, that we conclude that a greater diversity of gender, racial, and other backgrounds only further enhances our goals for academic vitality and excellence. In short, our efforts to increase the diversity of our faculty will serve to improve the quality of our programs, not threaten it.

“Color-Blind” Hiring Is Anything But
We also reject the idea that the only “fair” approach to recruitment and hiring is one that disregards information about the demographics and backgrounds of potential candidates. We recognize that such “color-blind” approaches usually result from a genuine desire to conduct an inclusive and unbiased search. However, a failure to attend to the ways in which racial, ethnic, or gender differences may have impacted a candidate’s educational history or scholarly focus can sometimes lead committees to disregard promising candidates. When we fall back on generic notions of “fit”—and what are often very traditional criteria for scholarly promise—we risk reproducing the status quo in our departments.

Furthermore, in order to combat the unconscious biases which research shows we all carry to some degree, search committees need to have frank conversations about the ways bias might influence their decisions and the strategies they will use to try to minimize that bias. Waiting until the final stage of a search is too late to begin this conversation; it must be part of the committee's working culture from the beginning.

Past Efforts at Stonehill
Our committee is not the first group to tackle the question of faculty diversity at Stonehill. Documentation of past efforts has not always been comprehensive, but we have been able to learn about some of the work that has been done in previous years. We have primarily found planning documents, and so while we have a good sense of the thinking that has gone into these questions, we do not have much data assessing how well those plans actually worked. Nevertheless, we believe it is useful to revisit the history of Stonehill’s conversations about increasing faculty diversity as we consider our next steps.

Strategic Planning
Since Stonehill began strategic planning in 2001, faculty diversity has been included—to greater and lesser degrees—as an objective in all three strategic plans. In the 2001-2005 plan, of the seven institutional objectives identified, two spoke specifically to increasing the number of underrepresented faculty on campus. Under the “Diversity” objective, the College set a goal of increasing the percentage of employees of color (including faculty and staff) from 4% to 10% by 2005. The “Academic Excellence” objective spoke more generally of goals to “provide support for academic diversity initiatives, including new curriculum opportunities, new recruiting tools, senior appointments, a recruitment reward plan, and faculty exchange opportunities.” In response to the 2001-2005 plan’s call for each division to implement a “Diversity Hiring Plan,” Katie Conboy, then Vice President for Academic Affairs, drafted a document in 2003 spelling out a number of strategies for improving faculty hiring (see Appendix A). Among the strategies described, the College’s participation in the Northeast Consortium for Faculty Diversity’s dissertation fellows program seemed to have gained the greatest traction (more details below).
The 2006-2010 plan did not include diversity as one of its nine overarching institutional priorities, but it still included a strategic objective specifically focused on increasing faculty diversity. Suggested strategies included diversifying the curriculum to make it more attractive to underrepresented candidates, positioning the Minority Dissertation Fellowships to more likely lead to tenure-track hires, and establishing a “supernumerary budget” to take advantage of opportunities to hire underrepresented candidates (what we’re terming “target of opportunity” hires). Elsewhere the plan also included objectives focused on improving hiring practices more broadly across the campus.

Our most recent plan, for 2011-2015, placed a greater emphasis on diversity issues, and included “Enhancing Diversity” as one of its five central goals. It sought to better assess the College’s efforts around diversity and build more opportunities for critical reflection on diversity by all in the campus community. It also called for a “proactive approach to supporting faculty, staff, and administrator searches in order to ensure a diverse candidate pool with consideration and hiring from the pool.” It suggested tracking of EEO hiring data and recruiting more underrepresented candidates into senior administrative positions. More specifically, it called for the creation of a new HR position focused primarily on diversity recruiting and the training of faculty to serve as “Diversity Liaisons” to search committees.

In a number of ways, we see the strategies put forth in these previous plans echoed in our current recommendations. Where our proposals hope to build on these past efforts is by 1) defining clearer processes for assessment and accountability and 2) requiring ongoing education of faculty about best practices in recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty.

It is also worth noting that as we move forward into the 2015-2020 planning process, it appears that diversity as a whole is being addressed less explicitly than in previous plans—and faculty/staff diversity even less so. The 2025 long-range plan, Light and Hope for Tomorrow puts most of its focus on student diversity and the curriculum and makes no mention of increasing the diversity of faculty or staff. And none of the four committees recently formed to develop the 2015-2020 strategic plan have been explicitly charged with addressing faculty diversity or hiring (it is interesting to note that the planning document that describes the intended work of the four committees doesn’t mention “diversity” at all). We hope this report can bring more explicit attention to hiring in the current planning process.

**Minority Fellows Program**

Based on past records and interviews with those involved in the program, it seems that the College joined the Northeast Consortium for Faculty Diversity (NCFD) around 2003, and hosted its first Minority Fellow through the NCFD’s Dissertation Scholars-in-Residence program most likely in the 2004-2005 academic year. The College seems to have hosted no more than four Minority Fellows total. In speaking with those familiar with the program, there is some lack of clarity as to why it was discontinued, but most agree that the program wasn’t on track to fulfill its intended goal of recruiting promising underrepresented scholars into tenure-track positions at Stonehill.

One reason suggested for this was simply the fact that the fellows were sometimes from academic fields in which “postdocs” were standard (and Stonehill didn’t offer the postdoctoral opportunities they needed). Another was that the fellows’ teaching schedules limited their interaction with departmental colleagues and that more intentional mentoring was needed. Others suggested that the fellows felt isolated on campus and were not given clear indications that the College wanted them to stay. In at least one case, it seemed that the administration mistakenly believed that a
fellow was not interested in staying and so did not pursue longer-term options—this, despite the fact that the fellow would have considered a longer-term appointment at the College. Again, we only have partial information with which to evaluate the success of the program, but it does seem that one conclusion is clear: it is not enough to recruit underrepresented scholars into positions at Stonehill—we must also be active in supporting them once they are here.

Other Efforts
The College Archives have records of diversity conversations dating back to 1993. The following are three of the more notable ones, in light of our current focus:

- At the end of 2000, a “Strategic Plan for Diversity” was compiled with the stated mission of “creat[ing] a quality of life on campus that acknowledges and celebrates the diversity of persons, cultures, beliefs and opinions. The existence of this diversity is a reaffirmation of the Catholic ideal of both free and critical inquiry and of the conviction that an education in dialogue with a diversity of viewpoints becomes empowering in the world in which this education must be practiced.” Among the plan’s goals were to increase the percentage of U.S. citizens of color to 10% of students, faculty, staff, and administration by 2005; to “educate the campus to the advantages and challenges of a diverse community”; and to “reinvigorate the curriculum by offering more courses that contain a genuine multicultural and intercultural content.” Suggested strategies included:
  - a clear commitment from the President and "throughout all the layers of administration" so that the institutional commitment to diversity is “clear and unequivocal”
  - charging the Standards and Evaluation Committee with developing strategies to increase faculty diversity (embedding the responsibility within existing structures rather than creating a new committee – “if diversity is truly the business of the College, it should be managed by those agencies currently charged with the conduct of that business”)
  - create an “atmosphere of accountability” around inclusive hiring, such as requiring department chairs to include at least one person of color on any final list of job candidates
  - adjust compensation levels for promising underrepresented candidates (in part to reflect the “cultural tax” of additional committee and mentoring work that faculty of color typically face) because the competitive market for attracting faculty of color “must be a motive for more aggressive practices, not an excuse for inactivity”

- Perhaps in response to the 2000 plan, a Cultural Diversity Subcommittee was formed in 2001 as part of the strategic planning process. As part of its work, it compiled a questionnaire to gauge Division Heads’ thoughts about a number of possible strategic initiatives. The questionnaire focused on student recruitment and retention, faculty and staff hiring, the curriculum, and campus climate. Among the many strategies explored was a proposal to establish opportunities for faculty “exchanges” with HBCUs or other minority-serving institutions and partnering with Holy Cross colleges with more diverse populations on academic programs. The archives has records of all the Division Head responses, which are too detailed to summarize here, but it is evident that there was a shared sense of responsibility—and perhaps even urgency—at that time for moving the College’s diversity goals forward (particularly its target of increasing ALANA student representation to 10% by 2005).
• In 2003, a “Diversity Initiative” document reported on the progress made toward the diversity goals spelled out in the 2001-2005 strategic plan. Among the strategies implemented at that point were the use of additional venues for advertising job openings (such as the affirmative action email service through higheredjobs.com and diversitylink.com) and the exploration of using the KNF&T employment agency as a diversity recruiter. The report recommended establishing a “diversity alumni database,” monitoring trends as to why employees leave the College, and better advertising diversity information.

Current Situation at Stonehill
Much of the data reported in the following sections was taken from the 2009-2010 and 2012-2013 Stonehill College Fact Book as well as from data shared by the Offices of Institutional Research and Human Resources. They represent the College’s best efforts to document employee demographics but show some understandable limitations. For example, employees may choose not to disclose certain demographic information, and we also encountered the occasional inconsistency in the data (e.g. a faculty member being coded as both a non-resident alien and ALANA). That said, we believe these numbers paint an accurate, if approximate, picture of our situation at Stonehill.

ALANA Faculty Representation
According to the 2012-13 Fact Book, of the 167 full-time faculty at Stonehill in 2012, 10% reported their race/ethnicity as ALANA (African American, Latino, Asian American, or Native American). This was up from 7% reported in 2005. This shows a slightly more consistent improvement than employee diversity overall at Stonehill (which moved from 7% ALANA in 2005 to 9% in 2012). Among part-time faculty, the percentages vary from year-to-year, ranging from 4% in 2011 to 9% in 2009 (see Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full Time Faculty</th>
<th>Part Time Faculty</th>
<th>Full Time Employees (staff &amp; faculty)</th>
<th>Part Time Employees (staff &amp; faculty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Percentage of ALANA faculty and employees (full-time and part-time) from 2005 – 2012. Note that faculty are included in the employee count.

Comparing our numbers to national data compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics, we see Stonehill’s recent increases in full-time ALANA faculty representation as a somewhat delayed reflection of a national trend of slowly improving ALANA representation at U.S. institutions of higher education (see Figure 2).
Looking to our peer and aspirant institutions, we see a wide range of ALANA faculty representation. Based on data provided by the Office of Institutional Research for a select group of private four-year institutions, we see Stonehill’s percentages numbering better than those at Muhlenberg and St. Michael’s but significantly lower than Bates, Connecticut, and Wheaton (see Figure 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bates College</td>
<td>data not available</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut College</td>
<td>data not available</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhlenberg College</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Michael’s College</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skidmore College</td>
<td>data not available</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehill College</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The representation of ALANA faculty (who have self-identified to the institution) across academic divisions shows our Professional programs as home to the largest percentages of ALANA faculty, with the Social Sciences trending upwards (see Figure 4). The Arts & Humanities have shown the least change over the past five years despite the fact that they brought in the greatest numbers of new hires during this period, averaging 3.2 new full-time hires per year (during the same time period the Social Sciences averaged 2.8 new full-time hires per year, STEM averaged 2.2, and Professional programs averaged 1.8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arts &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>STEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Percentage of full-time faculty who have self-identified as ALANA within each academic division from 2008 – 2012.

With such small numbers of ALANA faculty, breakdowns by department may be less meaningful, but it is notable how often an ALANA faculty member must deal with being “the only one” in his or her department (see Figure 5). These types of “solo” situations can contribute to feelings of isolation, increased sense of stereotype threat, and larger advising and other service demands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Percentage ALANA faculty</th>
<th>ALANA faculty in dept</th>
<th>Total faculty in dept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Criminology</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Administration</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Percentage of full-time ALANA faculty by department in 2012.
Female Faculty Representation
Although we have seen an increase in representation of female faculty among part-time positions in the past five years, there has been no consistent improvement in the percentage of full-time female faculty over this time, which is holding steady at 41% (see Figure 6).

![Figure 6. Representation of female faculty (full-time and part-time) from 2008-2012](image)

When we look at changes by division (among full-time faculty) over this time period, we also see very little shift in gender distribution, though there does seem to be a trend downwards for female representation in the Arts & Humanities and an upward trend in the STEM disciplines. This chart also shows that the STEM and Social Science areas show a greater representation of female faculty, while the Professional programs show the least (see Figure 7).

![Figure 7. Representation of female faculty (full-time only) in each division from 2008-2012](image)
Looking at changes across specific departments, very few trends emerge. The most striking is a shift in the Biology department from 64% full-time female representation in 2008 to 85% in 2012 (moving from seven to eleven full-time female faculty). During that same period we also see a representation shift in the Communication department from 43% to 63% (going from three to five full-time female faculty). The Foreign Languages department is the only to show a significant drop from 33% to 13% (from three full-time female faculty to only one). Comparing the representation of full-time female faculty across departments we see an incredible range of differences across the College – with especially high numbers in some of our STEM departments (see Figure 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Percentage female faculty</th>
<th>Female faculty in dept</th>
<th>Total faculty in dept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Criminology</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Administration</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Percentage of full-time female faculty by department in 2012

**Applicant Demographic Data**

With the adoption of the PeopleAdmin system, the Office of Human Resources is now able to gather demographic data more easily from applicants to faculty positions. Currently, applicants are given the option to self-identify according to ethnicity but are not asked to indicate their residency status. This means that we cannot separate out the numbers of ALANA candidates from those who are foreign-born nationals (and so we are not including those numbers in this report). We hope that with the implementation of our recommendation to gather more detailed demographic data from applicants, we will be better able to track our ALANA recruitment efforts in future years.
Department Chair Perspectives

As part of the committee’s investigation, we also conducted one-on-one interviews with 12 of Stonehill’s 19 department chairs (the full notes from those interviews are included in Appendix B below). These interviews revealed that most departments are genuinely interested in attracting a more diverse pool of candidates but feel there are institutional and other factors out of their control that make that task almost impossible.

Overall, the chairs seem to feel that the College claims to make diversity a priority but does not always back up its words with the resources needed to make it happen. For example, they find that it is hard to compete with other institutions for what is perceived to be a small pool of applicants, particularly for African American and Latino/a candidates. They feel our salaries—as well as campus climate, teaching load, standard course releases, pre-tenure sabbatical, start-up funds, etc.—are not competitive (at least in some fields), and so we are losing promising candidates to other institutions. When they did talk about hiring successes, most chairs mentioned international hires, rather than ALANA hires.

Some chairs identified the lack of a consistent procedure for awarding lines (which sometimes leads to short windows for the hiring process) as undermining diversification efforts. Last-minute postings make it difficult to recruit a diverse pool. They also see big differences among hiring processes for tenure-track, term, and adjunct appointments, which each make for distinct challenges.

In terms of hiring procedures in departments, it seems that most search committees consist of all the full-time faculty in the department (even non-tenured faculty in some cases). Many adhere to a “color blind” approach until the final stages of the search – first building a pool of the “most qualified” applicants and then considering diversity when discussing the final pool. The chairs did not seem to have a good sense of available venues for advertising to diverse groups in the field; they depend on Human Resources to make suggestions of alternative places to advertise, even though HR is not always privy to the best discipline-specific options.

Overall, there is a perceived need for greater collaboration and communication with the administration on these efforts: “It’s important to have departments and administrators work as collaborators on the process, rather than having someone dictating. In the past the department has felt that the administration wasn’t quite as eager to partner with them when they did have candidates they thought were good. There have to be frank conversations at beginning of searches.”

These interviews suggest that while there are definitely major institutional factors that need to be addressed, there are also departmental practices that could be improved. Encouraging departments to build in more networking efforts, to reconsider how they utilize data about candidate diversity throughout the hiring process, and to be more proactive in identifying advertising venues could have a positive impact on departmental efforts.
Recommendations

Based on our assessment of the current needs at Stonehill, the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Diversity respectfully submits the following recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for his consideration. We request a written response from the VPAA by April 15, 2014 detailing his plans for responding to these recommendations.

Although discussions of faculty diversity often focus on effective “recruitment and retention” of candidates from underrepresented groups, our research has shown that an effective effort must be broken down into a broader series of steps which span from before the search even begins to long after it has concluded. We’ve defined these areas as:

1. Networking—building networks in advance of the search cycle that may later yield potential candidates
2. Advertising—clearly expressing our commitment to inclusive hiring practices to a wide range of audiences
3. Evaluation—fairly evaluating applicants in ways that minimize unconscious bias
4. Recruitment—building a campus community and a benefits package that is attractive to potential hires
5. Mentoring—providing intentional support to faculty throughout the various stages of their careers
6. Promotion—developing inclusive tenure and promotion policies and procedures that do not inadvertently disadvantage certain kinds of scholars and/or scholarship
7. Oversight—putting in place systems that track our efforts at the individual, departmental, and institutional levels and policies for intervening when those efforts fall short.

We propose the following recommendations as first steps the College can take towards improving our efforts across these seven areas. (Appendix C contains a more comprehensive list of strategies—for individuals, departments, and the institution—which we present as a resource for future initiatives.)

Define Hiring Priorities

First of all, we encourage the President, the VPAA, and faculty leaders to come to consensus about our institutional priorities for faculty hiring. These priorities will inform the work on the remaining recommendations, so we ask that they be in place by the beginning of the next academic year.

The committee’s recommendation is that, in determining how resources are directed, institution-wide efforts should prioritize the recruitment and retention of faculty from traditionally underrepresented ethnic and racial groups in the U.S. (African Americans, Asian Americans, Latino/as, and Native Americans) and underrepresented women (women in fields traditionally populated by men). We would also recommend that departments be able to define additional priorities, if warranted, regarding other traditionally underrepresented groups in their field (e.g. LGBTQ faculty; faculty from poor and working class backgrounds; faculty with disabilities; and faculty from non-Christian religious traditions or who adhere to no religious tradition).
Non-Immigrant Groups: In addition, we encourage the institution to pay particular attention to the impact our efforts have on increasing the number of faculty from non-immigrant groups in the U.S. (specifically African-Americans, Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and Native Hawaiians). As JoAnn Moody argues in Faculty Diversity (2012), groups which immigrated to the U.S. have typically benefited from various social and economic networks that have privileged them in ways that those who were forced to assimilate through slavery and colonization have not.

This isn’t to say that both groups don’t suffer from racism and systemic discrimination but that 1) discrimination often works differently for immigrant vs. non-immigrant groups and 2) non-immigrant groups have historically been kept at the “bottom of the ladder” in the U.S. They are the least well-represented in the academy and so deserve the greatest attention in recruiting efforts.

International Faculty: Finally, we wish to emphasize that our focus on U.S. groups (i.e. what Stonehill refers to as ALANA faculty) is not meant to imply that the College doesn’t also need to be addressing hiring practices and policies regarding international faculty. On the contrary, these concerns are significant enough to warrant a separate study and recommendations report. We have encountered troubling stories about the experiences of our international faculty, and we urge the College to develop more consistent and transparent policies regarding international faculty hiring.

That said, it is also important to note that while international faculty certainly contribute in important ways to the intellectual and cultural diversity of our campus, their contributions are distinct from those that ALANA faculty bring. We encourage the College to see their efforts to recruit ALANA and international faculty as two parallel, but distinct, endeavors.

Standardize Search Approval Process

Standardize Search Timeline
In our interviews with chairs, it became clear that the unpredictable nature of our search approval process means that committees are often left without sufficient time to advertise thoroughly for positions. We recommend that the VPAA work with department chairs to establish a standard process and timeline for the approval of new searches. This process will obviously need to take into account the flexibility needed for hiring adjuncts or last-minute replacements, but to the degree possible, departments should be able to count on a predictable approval schedule.

Require Diversity Hiring Plan in Proposal
Furthermore, we recommend using the search approval process as the primary means for facilitating departmental conversations about improving diversity hiring practices. All search proposals should require a discussion of the department’s ongoing efforts towards faculty diversity (e.g. networking and mentoring efforts) as well as their specific plans for building a diverse pool for the proposed search. The department’s ongoing efforts and their plans for the proposed search will be taken into account by the VPAA in determining which searches are approved.

Require Regular Reports on Search Progress
The new search approval process and timeline should also include expected deadlines for submitting formal progress reports to the Provost’s office during the search process. For example, chairs may be required to report updates 1) once the full pool of applications is collected, 2) after the “first cut” has been determined, and 3) prior to issuing invitations for campus visits.
Reaffirm the Provost’s Responsibility to Intervene in Searches When Necessary
In order for any of these efforts to succeed over the long term, departments need to be held accountable to their own and the institution’s commitment to conducting an inclusive search. The VPAA and faculty leaders must have a frank discussion of the Provost’s role in holding search committees accountable. Our recommendation is that the Provost should take responsibility for maintaining oversight of search efforts and step in to intervene—or even suspend—a search when a committee is not meeting minimum expectations for conducting an inclusive search.

Create Faculty Search Handbook
Once the search approval process and timeline has been finalized, we recommend the VPAA assemble an ad hoc committee to create a Faculty Search Handbook. The handbook should both detail the policies and procedures regarding searches at Stonehill and make recommendations for conducting an inclusive search. Appendix C of this report can serve as a resource in developing the handbook.

Make Five-Year Financial Commitment to Hiring Efforts
Although we challenge the myth that our only hurdle is a financial one, having additional resources dedicated to this initiative over the next five years will allow us to move more quickly towards establishing a “critical mass” of underrepresented faculty. As the research on stereotype threat shows, the closer to “critical mass” an organization can achieve in terms of its percentages of members from minoritized groups, the less impact microaggressions and other environmental cues can have on job performance and job satisfaction for those employees. Furthermore, the committee takes seriously one department chair’s comment that Stonehill too often pursues “unfunded mandates” that tend to generate more frustration than progress. We recognize that the College is in a period of tighter finances; however, we believe a visible increase in our faculty’s diversity will help Stonehill position itself as a more attractive option to the increasingly diverse student pool we are recruiting from. We urge the College to commit .5% of its annual budget over the next five years towards our hiring efforts.

In addition, we encourage the administration to consider the following strategies:

Investigate the Impact of the Faculty Salary Grid on Hiring and Retention
The committee’s members hold a range of opinions about the effectiveness of the faculty salary grid. They agree, however, that an investigation is warranted as to the impact that the grid has on hiring and retention. There is a strong concern among some on the committee—and among the faculty at large—that the grid puts departments at a competitive disadvantage when trying to recruit promising underrepresented scholars into positions at Stonehill. We urge the administration to reassess the effectiveness of the grid and to pursue revisions to our current system that would allow departments greater flexibility when negotiating with potential hires.

Establish Pre-Tenure Sabbatical
A number of department chairs cited our lack of a pre-tenure sabbatical as one way in which they feel disadvantaged when trying to recruit promising scholars into junior faculty roles. Particularly in light of the added mentoring and service duties that often fall to underrepresented faculty, ensuring that those faculty have some dedicated time for developing their research agenda will help not only with recruitment but also with retaining traditionally underrepresented faculty at Stonehill.
Conduct Feasibility Study of “Target of Opportunity” Lines
In addition, we recommend that the VPAA work with faculty leaders and the VP for Finance to investigate the feasibility of establishing a budget line for “target of opportunity” hires in the coming years (and report their findings to the department chairs). The ability to take advantage of opportunities to hire promising underrepresented scholars outside the formal search process would not only increase our chances of success but would also provide additional motivation to departments to be active in their networking outside the search cycle. Furthermore, target of opportunity lines can allow for more flexibility when negotiating with candidates who have “dual career” concerns.

Establish Fund to Supplement Hiring Packages
The committee recommends the establishment of a budget line for supporting departments in crafting attractive hiring packages to promising candidates. Knowing that the funds are available (and wouldn’t need to be shifted from other initiatives) would give chairs and committees the confidence to pursue candidates they may otherwise deem out of reach. Such a line could be used to offer perks, such as increased start-up funds, a one-time “signing bonus,” or an additional course release in the first year.

Establish Fund to Support Departmental Efforts
The committee also recommends the establishment of a budget line for supporting departmental efforts to improve their networking, mentoring, and departmental climate. This fund could be used to support activities such as:

- hiring an outside consultant to assess the department’s climate (such as the APA’s Site Visit program: http://www.apaonlinecsw.org/home/site-visit-program)
- inviting a promising underrepresented scholar to speak on campus
- sending a member of the department to network at a conference likely to attract underrepresented scholars

Reaffirm Support for Faculty Scholarship
Since our goal is the hiring and long-term retention of underrepresented faculty, and since studies show that faculty from underrepresented groups are more likely to engage in scholarship that falls outside the boundaries of traditional research—thus possibly limiting their chances at receiving external research support—the College should affirm and augment its internal support for faculty scholarship by increasing funds for the SURE Program, Professional Development Grants, and Publishing Support Grants, as well as make available additional course releases to enable faculty excellence in scholarship.

Sustain Faculty Conversations About Inclusive Hiring Practices

Implement Required Search Committee Orientation
An inclusive search requires that all committee members share at least some degree of consensus around their diversity goals and feel comfortable discussing those goals throughout the search process. Because of this we recommend that all search committees be required to schedule an early “orientation” meeting meant to inform members of relevant policies and procedures, available resources, and strategies for recruiting underrepresented scholars. Most importantly, such a meeting should allow for open conversation about how members want to intervene when they
perceive the committee to be losing sight of its diversity goals (e.g. what happens if a member suspects unconscious bias may be influencing a decision to reject a candidate?).

Our recommendations are that orientation meetings should last no longer than one hour and should 1) be led by faculty presenters (or a faculty-staff team with someone from HR or Office of Intercultural Affairs), 2) be conducted in a seminar/discussion-based format, 3) cultivate a blame-free environment for discussing unconscious bias in hiring, and 4) provide “benchmarking” data that allows committee members to compare their department’s efforts to others, as well as Stonehill’s efforts to other institutions.

If all members of a search committee have already been through an orientation meeting in the previous two years, then the committee can request an abbreviated version of the orientation that will focus on clarifying the committee’s strategies for conducting an inclusive search.

**Implement Required Rank & Tenure Committee Orientation**

The same challenges that search committees face in overcoming unconscious bias in their evaluation of candidates also confront rank & tenure committees when evaluating their colleagues. In light of this, we also recommend that an annual “orientation meeting” for the Rank & Tenure Committee be implemented.

Similar to the Search Committee Orientation, the R&T Committee orientation meetings should last no longer than one hour and should 1) be led by faculty presenters, 2) be conducted in a seminar/discussion-based format, and 3) cultivate a blame-free environment for discussing unconscious bias in evaluation.

**Assess Rank & Tenure Requirements**

Studies show that faculty from underrepresented groups are more likely to engage in scholarship that falls outside the boundaries of traditional research and/or muddies the typical divisions among research, teaching, and service. Making clear the College’s commitment to support faculty who engage in such “non-traditional” approaches is necessary both to attract and retain underrepresented faculty to our campus.

We recommend that both departmental and college requirements for tenure and promotion be reviewed and, if necessary, revised to be more inclusive of such non-traditional approaches. This might include mention of civically-engaged teaching and scholarship, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, non-canonical subjects and methodologies, and digital scholarship.

**Track Diversity Efforts at All Levels**

In order to track the impact of our efforts and to be responsive to changing needs within our community, it is necessary that assessment of hiring strategies and other diversity efforts be put implemented at the faculty, departmental, and administrative levels. Such assessments should be as simple as possible so that compliance isn’t onerous, but comprehensive enough to provide meaningful data to inform future decision-making.

The committee recommends that the VPAA and the Faculty Senate develop a comprehensive assessment plan to be implemented at the start of the 2015-2016 academic year. Along the way we also recommend the following:
**Charge Senior Administrator with Overseeing Diversity Efforts**

The committee finds Connecticut College’s approach—which charges an existing senior administrator with overseeing the College’s diversity efforts and holding the other senior administrators accountable for diversity efforts in their own divisions—to be a good model for strengthening our diversity mission at Stonehill. This is not a recommendation to create an additional position in the senior administration; instead, we would like to see diversity oversight added to a current VP’s responsibilities.

To be clear, we are not suggesting that such an addition would in any way supplant current efforts on campus (e.g. the very important work of the Office of Intercultural Affairs or the efforts of our own committee). On the contrary, we envision the primary focus of such a position to be advocating for the support of those efforts and coordinating better communication among the various groups working on these questions across campus.

**Begin Annual Provost’s Report**

To promote transparency and shared responsibility for our hiring efforts, we recommend that the Provost begin an annual tradition of reporting to the Faculty Senate, Rank & Tenure Committee, and department chairs about the Division's efforts to build a more diverse faculty and a more welcoming campus community.

**Include Diversity Section in Departmental Annual Reports**

In order to better recognize and reward departmental efforts towards improving our hiring practices and our campus climate, we recommend that a new section be included in departmental annual reports that invites discussion of the department’s efforts that year to further the College’s diversity mission.

**Include Diversity in Faculty Annual Review**

In order to better recognize and reward individual faculty member’s efforts towards improving our hiring practices and our campus climate, we recommend that the Provost work with the Faculty Senate and Council of Chairs to revise the Annual Review form so that it invites discussion of the faculty member’s contributions that year to the College's diversity mission.

**Gather More Detailed Demographic Data of Candidates and Hires**

As part of ongoing assessment, we encourage the College to gather more detailed demographic data from job applicants and new hires. More granular data will allow us not only to assess our current goals but also to point to the need for changing priorities moving forward. We recommend that the College have a new demographic data-gathering plan in place by September 2014.

**Assess the Reasons Why Candidates Don’t Choose Stonehill**

We also recommend that HR investigate possible protocols for assessing why candidates choose not to accept positions at Stonehill. Having more reliable data about “lost” candidates may help departments improve their search efforts in the future.

**Make Our Commitment to Diversity Visible**

**Improve Standard Job Announcement Language**

The current standard language of job announcements (e.g. the description of the College and its equal opportunity hiring policy) is not always as effective as it could be in communicating our active commitment to diversifying our faculty. We recommend that department chairs work with the VPAA to develop alternative language—perhaps with multiple options for departments to
choose from—and that departments be given some flexibility in revising that language to best fit their field and the position they are advertising for.

Present Benefits Information in Clear and Inclusive Ways
Because of our identity as a Catholic college, job candidates will likely have questions (and preconceived notions) about how our affiliation with the Church will impact their experience as employees. Questions about benefits will certainly be among these. Women and LGBTQ candidates, in particular, will be looking to gauge how our Catholic identity impacts employee benefits, and so making that information easily accessible signals our interest in them as potential employees. Specifically, we recommend:

- Making explicit on our website, in job materials, and in communications to the campus community how our benefits impact traditionally marginalized groups, including women and members of the LGBTQ community.
- Being aware that in communicating with prospective employees about limits to our benefits, we can inadvertently reinforce assumptions about the “exclusiveness” of our community. One anecdote the committee heard involved a candidate whose campus visit started with being asked if she understood the College’s limits on birth control coverage—we recognize this was likely an attempt at transparency, but it was read by the candidate as a litmus test of whether she was “Catholic enough” to work at Stonehill.

Make Our Diversity Commitment Visible in Marketing Materials
Our commitment to growing and supporting a diverse faculty should be evident in any and all marketing materials a potential job candidate might encounter:

- For example, on the College website, the faculty “landing page” should have a visible, high-level page expressing the division’s commitment to recruiting and retaining faculty from underrepresented backgrounds. Other faculty-oriented parts of the website (pages for the Center for Teaching & Learning, Office of Academic Development, Dean of the Faculty, etc.) should also reaffirm the College’s commitment to inclusivity and incorporate diversity-related content when appropriate.
- A faculty recruitment brochure should also be developed that details the various faculty development programs and opportunities available at the College, and reaffirms the College’s commitment to building and supporting a diverse faculty. This brochure can be distributed to candidates on campus visits to help with “selling” Stonehill as a welcoming and supportive community.

Make Our Diversity Commitment Visible in the Curriculum
Underrepresented faculty look to the curriculum to help them gauge the inclusiveness of our community. For example, we have heard more than one story of a candidate for whom the existence of a Gender & Sexuality Studies Program at Stonehill served as a positive sign of our community’s openness as well as its commitment to academic freedom. We encourage the College to use this next strategic planning process as an opportunity to identify concrete steps towards building a greater critical engagement with diversity into our curriculum.

In the meantime, we urge the Academic Division to implement a policy which would allow courses that engage questions of diversity to run with lower initial enrollments. Such courses will help us attract students and faculty who are committed to the College’s mission of inclusiveness and social justice, but they will likely need a longer “ramping up” period to build a sufficient student audience. We recognize that such a policy will require an added financial investment, but we believe it is a necessary one if we wish to build a more welcoming and inclusive campus community.

[In 2003, Katie Conboy, then Vice President for Academic Affairs, drafted the following plan in response to the strategic plan’s call to increase the representation of faculty and staff of color to 10% by 2005.]

A Diversity Plan for Faculty at Stonehill College

In the strategic planning process, Stonehill College affirmed its commitment to diversifying its faculty, staff and student body. In order to meet new goals, Stonehill must be proactive in building consensus about the value of a diverse community of teacher/scholars and staff. We cannot underestimate the importance of this staff to attracting and retaining students of color.

The focus of our efforts in the faculty area must be three-fold: to examine our curriculum and to broaden the highly western focus of coursework to include more global perspectives; to increase minority faculty across all disciplines; and to create a community that embraces the plan to increase diversity on campus.

For faculty appointments, one or more of the following initiatives can augment our efforts:

- New Curriculum Opportunities
- New Recruiting Tools
- Senior Appointments
- The Stonehill Fellows Program
- Faculty Exchange with a Historically Black College
- Recruitment Reward Plan

New Curriculum Opportunities

Stonehill has begun an overall curriculum review with the revision of the General Education Program. The Cornerstone program opens up the traditionally Western Heritage Liberal Arts focus of the curriculum to include western encounters with varied cultures and introductions to non-western thought, texts, beliefs and practices. A planned reexamination of minor programs of study will also reveal areas where interdisciplinary study can enhance students’ understanding of world cultures. As we develop new areas of curriculum, we must be sensitive both to the ways that faculty of color can help us to bridge gaps in student intellectual growth and to the curricular areas in which minority faculty candidates hold higher percentages of doctoral degrees. New interdisciplinary minors and new areas of growth within majors could be prioritized—at least in part—according to the opportunities they create for diversity hires.

New Recruiting Tools

Department Chairs can be required to report on methods they use to identify and seek out minority candidates in every search. The Human Resources office keeps published lists of minority candidate pools in many disciplines. In addition, chairs and department members should use their contacts at other institutions to identify potential candidates and to urge them to apply. In some cases, it might also be necessary to exceed budgeted staffing plans and to hire more than one individual from a search, effectively creating “bridge” years before senior faculty members retire in a particular department. This year we will participate for the first time in the Northeast
Consortium for Faculty Diversity. We will bring one “Dissertation Fellow” to campus in an area slated for future hiring. This may provide an opportunity to allow the department and the dissertation fellow to learn more about each other before the dissertation fellow applies for a full-time job at the College.

Senior Appointments

When a department indicates a need for a faculty member in a particular area, it can sometimes be an advantage to seek candidates at the advanced level or to be open to advanced candidates in searches started at the junior level. Senior candidates are less in need of the institutional adjustment or the professional adjustment that attends every faculty member at the outset of his/her career. When minority candidates can be identified and given advanced standing in the search process, this should be considered.

The Stonehill Fellows Program

With funds from the Frueauff Foundation, Stonehill has created a “Stonehill Fellows Program” to attract late-stage doctoral candidates to teach in the General Education Program and be mentored by senior Stonehill faculty members. Several doctoral-granting institutions have already indicated their interest in collaborating on this project. This year, we had two fellows on campus. We are taking applications for three fellows next year, and we have publicized the Stonehill Fellows Program to minority candidates who originally applied to us through the Northeast Consortium for Faculty Diversity. We hope to increase a diversity presence on campus through this program.

Faculty Exchanges

Stonehill should seek formally to partner with an historically black college on a faculty exchange program. Historically black colleges are often looking for diversity as well, and we could create a mutually beneficial program, especially if we can locate an institution similar to Stonehill in its proximity to an urban intellectual center. Individuals coming to Stonehill would teach for us for the agreed upon period of time and would have access to the libraries, collections, and academic networks of the Boston-Cambridge-Providence area. Stonehill faculty would have the identical opportunities at the partner institution. Such exchanges would create an ongoing minority presence on campus.

Recruitment Reward Plan

Sufficient funds should be set aside to reward departments that show their support of the College’s commitment to diversifying the faculty: supplemental travel, speakers, library, or other appropriate allocations could be considered.

The benefits to students and current faculty for diversity hiring should be clear: all students benefit from their classroom and mentoring experiences with a diverse faculty. A vibrant academic community must include a wide range of perspectives and experiences, and Stonehill will have a richer environment to the extent that it can enhance its faculty with diversity as one goal of future hiring.
Appendix B: Chair Interviews

Chairs interviewed (spring 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akira Motomura</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Kevin Spicer</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Lännström</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Louis Liotta</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ives</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Magdalena Pederson</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Wetzel</td>
<td>Soc &amp; Crim</td>
<td>Mike Tirrell</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Salvucci</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ralph Bravaco</td>
<td>Math &amp; CS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Themes from the interviews

- the College has been giving a lot of “lip service” to faculty diversity but not always backing that up with the resources needed to make it happen
- it is hard to compete with other institutions for what is perceived to be a small pool of applicants, particularly for African American and Latino/a candidates (some consider it an “impossible” task)
- our salaries are not competitive (though this is more a concern in some fields than others)
- teaching load, course release, pre-tenure sabbatical, campus climate, start-up funds are not always competitive with other institutions
- there is not a good sense of available venues for advertising to diverse groups in the field; departments seem to depend on HR suggestions for alternative places to advertise
- most chairs count international hires among their successes in “diversity hiring”
- many first identify the most qualified (sometimes in a “blind” process) and then consider diversity with the final pool
- there are big differences among hiring processes for tenure-track, term, and adjunct appointments – last-minute postings make it difficult to recruit a diverse pool
- the lack of a consistent procedure for awarding lines (which sometimes leads to short windows for the hiring process) undermines diversification efforts
- most full-time faculty in the department (even non-tenured) typically participate in the search
- there is a need for departmental ownership/open communication with administration: “It’s important to have departments and administrators work as collaborators on the process, rather than having someone dictating. In the past the department has felt that the administration wasn’t quite as eager to partner with them when they did have candidates they thought were good. There have to be frank conversations at beginning of searches.”

What’s working: examples from individual departments

- one department has a discussion about diversity before the beginning of the search – e.g. talks through how to identify applicants that may be able to contribute to the department’s diversity efforts
• in order to craft a more open-ended job call, one department’s description “drew on the language from the Academic Vision Statement, emphasizing the teacher-scholar model. They decided to maximize flexibility in how they framed the advertisements, not just advertising for someone who did work in X area but for someone who could teach the core classes in discipline and ‘otherwise complement department strengths’”

• in the initial screening process, one department has each application read by at least two committee members so that promising candidates aren’t overlooked

• in the initial screening, one committee agrees that when “on the fence” they keep the application in the pool so that a larger group gets a chance to weigh in

• before the campus visit, one department asks candidates if there’s anyone else beyond the usual administrators and department members they’d like to meet (such as faculty of color, international faculty, or women in other departments)

• one department tries to gear campus visits so they are responsive to the particular candidate’s situation (e.g. if a candidate is living in Cambridge, arrange a meeting with a faculty member living there)

What needs to change: voices of department chairs

• approve searches in a timely fashion so that the department has time to do a thorough search

• commit to more tenure-track lines (rather than making do with term appointments) – shorter-term contracts makes it difficult to recruit and retain diverse faculty: “When people are good, a three-year contract is really a two-year contract. Those people aren’t spending time with students, because they’re looking elsewhere until we have committed to them.”

• the salary grid is 1) too low and 2) too rigid – makes it hard to negotiate a competitive salary that is also in line with the candidate’s needs in terms of time to tenure (e.g. a candidate moving from a vastly different institution – such as a large university or an HBCU – may need additional time to adjust to teaching at Stonehill and so would be challenged by a shorter tenure clock; one department reports having to offer someone a higher rank than made sense just so they could offer a competitive salary) – consider allowing for exceptions in the grid for underrepresented candidates: “The grid creates an illusion of equity that is not completely real; the business program is on a different grid, so maybe there could be a decision to put some candidates on a different grid as well.”

• offer greater course releases for new hires (e.g. one department was competing with a school who offered the equivalent of five course releases within the first three years)

• get creative in other ways we can attract candidates besides money: “We could encourage smaller initiatives like funding a pet project or starting a student journal: give them a budget and work study students for that. Tell candidates that we’ll create a little corner for you in our institution to grow things you want to grow. The college needs to think creatively about making faculty feel really welcome and at home in ways other than money.”

• have lines held in reserve so departments can pursue potential hires outside the approved search cycle
• a shift in attitude among the faculty is needed – challenging the perception that hiring underrepresented candidates means hiring less qualified candidates (we need to “artfully” promote the idea that increasing diversity increases academic excellence)

• educate faculty about unconscious bias (e.g. that looking for folks who went to a SLAC might exclude some candidates of color)

• encourage departments to have a frank discussion at the beginning of the search (and maybe have faculty/staff identified who are trained to facilitate that conversation) about their priorities for the search and what their goals are regarding diversity

• pay better attention to job call language (e.g. being explicit in seeking to hire women)

• the College needs more consensus in how we define “diversity” (e.g. is there not some contradiction in our expressed desire for diversity while at the same time we deny benefits to same-sex couples?) and a clearer vision of why and how we are working for greater diversity institution wide: “We don’t have a consistent plan that we live out that shows that we actually care about these things, and that articulates why we care about them mindfully and intentionally.” We should be careful not to let our better numbers on the student side lead to complacency.

• the non-discrimination policy is still an issue – chairs are getting questions from candidates about whether they and their work will be supported (e.g. both LGBTQ candidates and those who did research on LGBTQ issues): “It’s always an awkward conversation at conferences and during the search process when they ask the search committee what the policy means, and the chair can’t give them an honest answer. He can say that at the department level and generally on the faculty people are supportive, but institutionally, he doesn’t really know if he can assure people.”

• develop clearer policies around hiring international faculty – and more generous policies around awarding work visas/green cards

• create guidelines for departments doing searches (one suggestion is to have the chairs develop a guide, perhaps modeled on Skidmore’s: at http://cms.skidmore.edu/hr/policies/hiring-guidelines.cfm; Skidmore has also compiled a list of discipline-specific locations for advertising calls: http://cms.skidmore.edu/hr/eeo_diversity/upload/DIVERSITY-Recruiting-RESOURCES-1_29_13.pdf)

Other suggestions/comments/questions:

• make sure the PeopleSearch system is left open past the deadline to accept letters in case mentors are slow in submitting recommendations

• build time in campus visits for candidates to visit neighboring communities (i.e. knowing that we have a diverse community nearby, such as Brockton, can be a draw)

• look into “pipeline” programs meant to encourage underrepresented students to enter the field as a possible target for recruiting

• also increase efforts of diversifying staff on campus – helps add to the sense of Stonehill as a welcoming place to work and study
• Dean of the Faculty/Provost should explicitly discuss diversity goals with chairs before a search commences
• compile a list of equivalent degrees for non-US institutions, so committees know how to evaluate international applicants
• look at how our numbers compare to peer institutions – are we behind our peers or is our lack of diversity typical?
• are we “scaring off” potential candidates because of our Catholic identity?
• What happened to minority fellows program? Why didn’t those fellowships lead to TT positions?

Appendix C: Compilation of Short and Long-Term Strategies

In the course of our research, we compiled an extensive list of suggested strategies that individual faculty, departments, and institutions can take to positively impact the recruitment and retention of underrepresented faculty. The recommendations above represent what we think are the most logical next steps for Stonehill to take, but we list all of our findings below to serve as a resource for future work and as a guide in developing informational materials for the current initiative.

1. Networking

Waiting until a search is approved to begin seeking out candidates is often too late. Work put into building networks in advance of the search cycle can pave the way for more effective recruitment once a line is approved. There are small things that individual faculty members, as well as departments, can do to flesh out their networks with promising underrepresented scholars, especially when those efforts are supported by the administration.

*Individual faculty:*

• maintain contact with advisors and graduate school colleagues
• make time at conferences to attend presentations and meetings where opportunities for networking with underrepresented scholars is likely
• seek out conferences, professional organizations, and other events likely to attract underrepresented scholars

*Department:*

• appoint an individual who is responsible for overseeing/coordinate departmental networking efforts
• maintain active contact with alums (particularly those who go on to graduate school)
• work with Alumni Affairs and Office of Intercultural Affairs to identify opportunities for reaching out specifically to alums from underrepresented groups (e.g. OIA organizes the Stonehill Alumni of Color Group)
• identify relevant groups within professional organizations and join their listservs/newsletters; insure that departmental faculty attend their meetings and/or special sessions at national conferences
• develop relationships with programs that have a good track record for graduating underrepresented scholars
• seek out opportunities to invite promising underrepresented scholars to campus for guest lectures or seminars

Division/Institution:
• create a special travel fund to provide financial support to faculty who attend a conference with the primary goal of networking for the department
• create a special fund to support honoraria for bringing promising scholars to campus as lecturers, etc.
• establish a post-doc program for underrepresented graduates (ideally using a “cohort” model that brings multiple post-docs to campus in a single year) – the Consortium for Faculty Diversity in Liberal Arts Colleges would be one avenue for pursuing this (http://www.gettysburg.edu/about/offices/provost/cfd/)
• consider creating other alumni affinity groups (for female alums, LGBTQ alums, etc.), which would allow for easier networking with these communities

2. Advertising

Both the content of a job call and where it is advertised can make a significant difference in the size and diversity of a candidate pool. Departments, HR, and the Academic Division each have important roles to play in developing effective advertising strategies.

Department:
• search committees should be provided information about a range of advertising strategies and venues (including getting the word out to the alums, advisors, and promising scholars in their network)
• include a requirement in application materials that candidates address how they can contribute to the College’s efforts towards diversity and inclusion (either by inviting discussion of it in the cover letter or in a separate “inclusive excellence” statement)
• job calls should go beyond the standard boilerplate in signaling the department’s interest in recruiting underrepresented scholars (e.g. signal this interest within the job description itself)
• search committees should work with HR to ascertain what percentage of applicants are from underrepresented groups; if an insufficient percentage have applied then additional advertising venues should be explored (perhaps with an extension to the application deadline)

Division/Institution:
• create a consistent and timely process for the authorization of new searches so that committees have time to advertise widely and work within their fields’ typical search timelines
• as part of the search committee “orientation” meeting (more details below), address ways that position expectations/descriptions can inadvertently disadvantage some underrepresented candidates—examples of alternative descriptions should be provided
• publicize academic searches “in house,” as well—colleagues in other departments may also have contacts with promising candidates

• promote interdepartmental cooperation around recruitment by being transparent about how new lines are assigned and what positions are open in a given year

• feature our non-discrimination statement prominently on the College website

• consider developing a “welcome statement” that articulates the College’s commitment to a welcoming community (e.g. http://www.central.edu/about/welcome-statement/)

3. Evaluation

Even well-meaning individuals can allow unconscious biases and other unchallenged assumptions to influence how they evaluate candidates. Open discussion among committee members about these potential biases and how they plan to minimize them can lead to more fair assessment of candidates’ strengths and weaknesses. In addition, committees may choose to shift some of their search practices in order to build a more diverse pool (e.g. interviewing a larger number of applicants).

Individual Faculty:

• take responsibility for monitoring one’s own unconscious bias and speak up in committee meetings about possible biases that are entering the conversation

• throughout the evaluation stage, committee members should be careful that their desire for a candidate who will be a “good fit” with the department does not end up just duplicating the existing demographics within the department.

Department:

• insure a fair distribution of work among search committee members

• make sure search committee members are not overcommitted in other areas and so unable to devote the necessary time to a thorough review of materials

• search committee chairs should be prepared to address possible bias during the process, to challenge problematic claims about “fit,” and to insure that all committee members’ perspectives are heard

• as candidate pools are narrowed, the department should continue working with HR to keep an eye on the number of candidates from underrepresented groups; if the numbers aren’t meeting expectations, then the committee should revisit applications from the larger pool to see if any promising candidates were overlooked (and decide if further advertising is needed to recruit additional candidates)

• committees may wish to give additional consideration to inclusiveness and diversity as they select candidates for first and second round interviews. For example, choosing to interview applicants who may seem, on paper, to be slightly outside (but not below) the criteria for selection, gives such applicants a chance to demonstrate to the committee how best they may fit the position

Division/Institution:

• assemble a resource packet that informs search committees of College policies, local and federal hiring laws, and institutional resources available to support the search
require all search committees to have one “orientation” meeting that will review College policies and procedures and also discuss the research on minimizing bias in hiring decisions

4. Recruitment

It’s important to recognize that for underrepresented faculty, the decision to take a new job often goes beyond salary and benefits. Of course, the more we can do to make Stonehill a great place to work, the easier our recruitment efforts will be. But candidates will also be considering whether the campus climate is welcoming and safe for faculty from underrepresented groups, if there are local communities where they will feel “at home,” and if their work will be supported by the institution.

Individual Faculty:
• make time to meet with candidates in home department or other departments when asked
• seek out opportunities to support classroom and campus initiatives meant to improve campus climate for underrepresented students and employees
• be visible in one’s support for an inclusive campus climate (e.g. display a “Safe Zone” placard)

Department:
• arrange campus visits so that candidates have the opportunity to meet a variety of people who are potential mentors/friends/allies to them and who will give them a good sense of our community (newer faculty in other departments, other faculty from underrepresented groups, potential research partners, CTL director, OIA staff, students, etc.)
• arrange tours of the local community that may be significant to the candidate (local churches, neighborhoods, school districts, etc.)—HR and Office of Intercultural Affairs can provide useful guidance in planning such a tour

Division/Institution:
• commit to more tenure-track lines (rather than term appointments) to help both with recruitment and retention
• establish “target of opportunity” lines so departments can take advantage of opportunities to recruit promising underrepresented faculty outside of an approved search (or to support spousal hires for promising candidates)
• articulate a specific spousal hiring policy
• consider possibilities for negotiating salaries that are not hindered by “the grid”
• be creative in building attractive packages for candidates and make clear to search committee chairs what resources are available (e.g. additional moving allowance, start-up funding, additional course release, etc.)
• offer all new faculty an additional course release to be taken in the first year (to make time for participation in extended new faculty orientation programming)—and consider the possibility of a pre-tenure sabbatical
• provide housing assistance to new faculty (e.g. on-campus housing options; buying properties in Easton that can serve as affordable, short-term housing for new hires, etc.)
• provide some kind of child care support to all employees (or even some employees – setting aside even a small fund that can be used to subsidize the child care costs of employees with the greatest need would be a good first step in addressing this gap in our benefits package)

• establish inclusive family leave policies (e.g. parental leave rather than maternity leave)

• reconsider limitations on benefits to women and LGBT employees (e.g. covering birth control and fertility treatments; covering same-sex spouses on health benefits, etc.); there needs to be consistency between what we say—such as in our nondiscrimination statement—and what we do as an institution

• establish a structure that allows faculty to be tenured in interdisciplinary programs—and investigate whether joint appointments between departments and programs could allow for creating more attractive positions for underrepresented candidates

• appoint a committee charged with investigating 1) how our curriculum, as a whole, can better reflect our institutional commitment to diversity and inclusion and 2) whether an Ethnic Studies or Critical Race Studies program would be a positive addition to the curriculum

• create a faculty “view book” to share with candidates that has a section devoted to resources available for underrepresented faculty

5. Mentoring

Existing mentoring models may not be sufficient to address the particular demands faced by underrepresented faculty and their departments (e.g. underrepresented faculty are often overburdened with advising and committee work, can feel disproportionate levels of stress and isolation, and may have a research agenda that is significantly different than most departmental colleagues). Departments and the institution need to be creative in providing on-going support to underrepresented faculty as they navigate professional milestones.

**Individual Faculty:**

• seek out opportunities to meet other faculty, particularly those from underrepresented groups (e.g. attend Opening Faculty Meetings and Academic Development Days)

• seek out opportunities for research collaboration with other scholars on campus and in peer institutions to serve as cohort peers

• be open to acting as a formal or informal mentor to faculty colleagues

**Department:**

• educate chairs and other potential mentors about the particular challenges underrepresented faculty can face (e.g. being overburdened with committee and advising duties) and how to advise faculty in ways to avoid letting those challenges undermine their chances for tenure and promotion

**Division/Institution:**

• continue support for new faculty (e.g. New Faculty Orientation, New Faculty Seminar, New Faculty Mentoring Program, Junior Faculty Mixer, Tenure & Promotion Retreat, etc.)

• explore creating programs specifically for faculty of color (e.g. incorporating a breakout session for faculty of color as part of the Tenure & Promotion Retreat)
• continue programs targeted at supporting employees of color (e.g. Faculty and Staff of Color Lunches)
• explore options (such as the “Mutual Mentoring” model at UMass-Amherst) to provide ongoing mentoring for faculty in later stages of their careers
• support underrepresented faculty in developing mentoring relationships outside of Stonehill (e.g. by providing additional development funds to support professional networking)
• cover costs for participation in faculty development programs targeted at underrepresented faculty (e.g. the National Center for Faculty Development & Diversity http://www.facultydiversity.org/)

6. Promotion
Because of the disproportionate demands often placed on underrepresented faculty, they can face challenges in making timely progress towards tenure (e.g. additional committee responsibilities can slow down research productivity). In addition, students who come from more homogenous backgrounds can be slow to accept the authority of an instructor from an underrepresented group. While this does not always lead to lower course evaluations, it can mean that underrepresented faculty must put more emotional and intellectual effort into their courses than their majority group colleagues. This, too, can impact research productivity as well as perceptions of “collegiality” by colleagues (e.g. someone who’s exhausted by a hostile class may not be eager to make pleasant hallway conversation). Finally, underrepresented faculty are more likely to engage in research approaches or trajectories that may be unfamiliar to departmental colleagues and those on the Rank & Tenure Committee. It is important that tenure and promotion requirements do not inadvertently penalize underrepresented faculty by failing to take into account their sometimes unique situations. It is also important that those who evaluate tenure and promotion candidates are thoughtful in how they interpret the “professional success” of underrepresented colleagues.

Individual Faculty:
• stay up-to-date with new developments in the field, particularly those that push the boundaries of traditional scholarship

Department:
• invite discussion among chairs and departments about the particular challenges underrepresented faculty can face (e.g. being overburdened with committee and advising duties) and invite discussion about how to take those kinds of demands into account when evaluating tenure and promotion materials
• invite discussion among chairs and departments about “nontraditional” approaches to scholarship and how to evaluate them—challenge assumptions that methodologies like auto-ethnography or community-based research are somehow “softer” or less rigorous than more traditional methods
• look to disciplinary organizations for guidance on how new developments in the field should be supported and evaluated (e.g. the MLA’s statement on the “digital humanities”)

Division/Institution:
• educate Rank & Tenure Committee about the particular challenges underrepresented faculty can face (e.g. being overburdened with committee and advising duties) and invite
discussion about how to take those kinds of demands into account when evaluating tenure and promotion materials

• educate Rank & Tenure Committee about “nontraditional” approaches to scholarship and how to evaluate them—challenge assumptions that methodologies like auto-ethnography or community-based research are somehow “softer” or less rigorous than more traditional methods

• clarify the relationship between departmental and institutional requirements for tenure and promotion; clarify the procedure for proposing updates to the institutional requirements

7. Oversight

Although many faculty these days are wary of “assessment and accountability” plans, it is necessary to implement oversight of both departmental and institutional efforts to improve our hiring practices in order for these initiatives to have lasting impact. Tracking the progress of individual searches as they move through the various recruitment stages, as well as our overall hiring rates over time, will allow us to identify what strategies are working and where additional resources are needed. Tracking also allows us to celebrate our successes and to recognize exceptional work by faculty and departments.

Individual Faculty:

• introduce a new section in the annual review that asks faculty to report on their efforts to contribute to Stonehill’s diversity goals

Department:

• require search committees to collaborate with HR to gather demographic data about the applicant pool throughout the various stages of the search and to use that data to guide decision-making (e.g. extending an application deadline if the candidate pool is not sufficiently diverse)

• require search committee chairs to submit preliminary reports at defined stages throughout the search process and a final report evaluating the search’s success (the specifics of these requirements will be defined by the VP for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Faculty Senate, etc. – see below)

Division/Institution:

• the VP for Academic Affairs submits an annual report to the President, the Faculty Senate, and all department chairs evaluating that year’s efforts towards diversifying the faculty (this report should focus not only on departmental efforts, but also on divisional and institutional efforts, as well)

• the VP for Academic Affairs works with the Faculty Senate and department chairs to define minimum expectations for each stage of the search process (including committee reporting requirements)

• the VP for Academic Affairs works with the Faculty Senate and department chairs to develop a manageable “assessment and accountability” plan for faculty searches, including the appointment of an individual or committee who will be responsible for providing oversight to all searches to insure that minimum expectations are met; if minimum
expectations are not met, committees will be alerted, be offered additional support, and—if efforts don’t improve—have their search suspended until problems are resolved

- throughout the search process, search committees must be provided with sufficient administrative support so that the committee can focus their energies on the work of attracting and evaluating candidates
- the institution should collect detailed demographic data on applicants and new hires (such as non-immigrant minority status) to allow for better tracking of the impact of new hiring efforts

Appendix D: Resources


http://diverseeducation.com/article/50320/#
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