

FACULTY DIVERSITY AND EXCELLENCE:
A REPORT AND A PRACTICAL VISION FOR THE FUTURE

*Report of the Equity and Diversity Committee of the College of Letters and Science to
Dean Gary Sandefur and the College Community, September 2007.*

Members of the Equity and Diversity Committee
of the College of Letters and Science, 2006-2008:

Steve J. Stern (History), Chair
Michael Bernard-Donals (English)
Leslie Bow (Asian-American Studies; English)
Vera Crowell (Office of Dean, L & S)
Robert Livingston (Afro-American Studies; Psychology)
Ben Márquez (Political Science; also CLS)
Ruby Paredes (Assistant Vice-Chancellor)
Judi Roller (Associate Dean, L & S)
Francisco Scarano (History; also CLS, LACIS)
Aliko Songolo (French & Italian; African Languages & Literature)
Adrienne Thunder (Cross-College Advising, L & S)
Herb Wang (Associate Dean, L & S; Geology)

Guide to Contents

Title page	1
Guide to Contents	2
Introduction: Background and Focus	3
Considering the Rationale: Why Diversity Matters	4
Research Activities	6
Key Findings	7
Recommendations (I): Searches and Recruitment	11
Recommendations (II): Mentoring for Tenure	14
Recommendations (III): Professional Development	16
Envisioning the College in 2020: Faculty Diversity and Excellence	18
Appendix A: Specific Elements of a Continuous Best-Practice Approach to Diversity in Searches	20
Appendix B: Notes on Legal Aspects of Target-of-Opportunity, Diversity, and Searches	23

Introduction: Background and Focus

Dean Gary Sandefur constituted the current Equity and Diversity Committee (hereinafter EDC) in Spring 2006, and met with it in May to discuss its duties and set an agenda. He noted a wide range for study and possible improvement of diversity and climate for faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students, and about which he would welcome advice. He also observed that the EDC would be unable to work on all areas at once, and would be wise to establish priorities or distinct phases of work.

The EDC functions as an advisory committee to the Dean, who has the ultimate responsibility of deciding, after due consultation and deliberation, whether to adopt our recommendations as College policy.

The EDC ethos is results-oriented, and its method has been dialogic. We have sought to develop practical ideas that are achievable and likely to make a tangible difference, and that build on dialogue and brainstorming within the College community.

The EDC established that its first phase of work, through Fall 2007, would focus on faculty diversity issues, with concentration on faculty of color but also mindful of gender. To this end, we focused on practical recommendations for improvement in three domains. Each is important in its own right and as a factor in climate and retention. These domains are: (a) recruitment/searches; (b) mentoring for tenure; and (c) professional development.

As shall become evident below, study of how to improve our practices to enhance faculty diversity and climate *also* leads to discovery of ways to improve quality and climate for all, both majority and minority. An obvious example is the recommendation below about research support semesters for new probationary faculty, but this spirit and expectation infuses all our recommendations. If adopted, the recommendations will improve the College and its excellence for everyone.

In a second phase, beginning in Spring 2008, the EDC will begin to shift its focus toward staff and student issues, and will work with the Dean to revise its membership in a manner that best serves this purpose. It should be noted, however, that some of the research and ideas developed in the first phase will be relevant or useful for addressing staff and student issues. An obvious example is the recommendation below about outstanding achievement awards.

This report is a self-contained narrative supplemented by two appendices that elaborate on specific recommendations. We also provide, for sake of greater transparency and access to data by all, a dossier of key documents – including data on College head counts, tenure rates, and climate – mentioned in the report.

Considering the Rationale: Why Diversity Matters

While our mandate is not to develop an extended rationale for the value of faculty diversity, it is worth pausing to consider why the issue matters, and how it connects to the pursuit of excellence – in research, teaching, and public service – at the heart of the University and College mission.

To set the diversity theme in more precise context, it is worth noting that this report and our mandate focused on a subset of the several kinds of diversity important to academic life. This aspect will be important once we turn to broader consideration of the relationship between diversity and excellence. We have focused on historically under-represented groups in university faculties – namely, women, African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, and Native Americans. We adopted a succinct working definition that recognizes the role of power (historically and in the present) in under-representation: “Human resource diversity refers to under-representation when underlying power differential exists.”

There are several valid reasons that faculty diversity matters and contributes to the mission of the College and public universities more generally. We need not rehearse these at length, because they are relatively well known and accepted. Among such rationales are the following. (1) Faculty diversity contributes to the educational experience and needs of students, by providing a wider array of role models and mentors, and a wider range of social networks, experiences, and perspectives relevant for student knowledge and success. In a world of increased racial/ethnic and gender diversity in the professions and the work place, such exposure benefits not only students of color and women, but also majority students and men. (2) Faculty diversity is one factor that helps a university build and sustain greater student diversity, which is in turn a worthwhile goal in a democratic society. Public universities have a social responsibility, in a democratic society, to enhance the effort to utilize the talents of all and to create opportunities for all. (3) Business cultures, too, increasingly value multi-cultural competence and experience. Improved faculty and student diversity improve the University’s ability to serve the Wisconsin economy and competitive needs of all its students, whether majority or minority, whether men or women.

Beyond these reasons, however, there is the connection between diversity and the pursuit of academic excellence. Diversity in its various senses – including the social diversity linked to historical under-representation and discrimination – is an important tool for achieving intellectual vitality.

Universities already recognize this point in a variety of ways. For example, universities recognize the importance of generational diversity for intellectual vitality. New people less committed to established paradigms bring in new research questions or new ways of looking at old questions. They may even create new subfields of knowledge. A second example is that research universities (with the notable exception of Harvard until relatively recently!) commonly recognize the importance of recruiting faculty who earned their doctoral degrees at a university different from the hiring

institution. To hire people from one's own graduate program opens the door to a kind of intellectual and cultural homogeneity – an institutional cloning – that dampens creativity. *Ceteris paribus*, it is best to bring in people who emerge from different experiences and institutional cultures. A third example is the value placed on having different subfields of knowledge rub up against each other in departments. Quality universities understand the importance of striking a balance between “building on strength,” and specializing too narrowly. Too much homogeneity within a narrowly defined subfield or a narrow range of disciplines carries a cost, whether an absence of a knowledge field or subfield important for students in a well rounded curriculum, or an artificial limitation on research imposed by relative dearth of cross-field talk. A fourth example, similar to the third, is the occasional initiative by universities – including our own, in the cluster hiring initiative of recent years – to promote interdisciplinary hiring. The diversity introduced by cross-field talk and by the ability to research and teaching newly emerging fields adds to overall vitality.

Social diversity, like generational diversity and diversity of fields, can bring into play new research questions, new ways of looking at old questions, and sometimes the potential to create new fields or subfields. It is far too crude and simple minded to reduce one's research questions, field interests, or interpretive line of analysis to the social background of the scholar. For example, a male medical researcher may be profoundly interested in women's health as a field of knowledge. Likewise, some white historians made profoundly important contributions to the new “Black history” that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. But it is also far too crude and simple minded to suppose that individual life experiences, and a social climate open to more diverse influences, have no impact whatsoever on the intellectual questions we ask or the new knowledge fields we create. For example, it would be naïve to suppose that women's health would have become as vital a research field in the absence of women's increased presence on campuses, their greater visibility in professional and cultural spheres from which they were once excluded, and the creation of Women's Studies as a new interdisciplinary field of knowledge.

“Old” fields are also affected by the social diversity of its practitioners. One of the most well researched and well balanced such analyses is a history of the U.S. historical profession by University of Chicago historian Peter Novick. (See his widely acclaimed *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988], 339 for quote below; for debate and commentary, *American Historical Review* 96:3 [1991], 675-708.) Particularly illuminating is Novick's analysis of the impact of the sensibilities brought into historical writing about Populism and about African-American history by the increased presence and acceptance of Jewish scholars in the profession by the 1960s. Most Gentile historians welcomed the new research questions and interpretations, even when they sometimes disagreed, but some were also uneasy. The President of the American Historical Association, Carl Bridenbaugh, went so far as to decry in his 1962 presidential address the “products of lower middle-class or foreign origins” who could not truly understand American culture. Most historians eschewed Bridenbaugh's crude remarks, and it is too simple to reduce the perspectives in play only to the increased visibility and

contribution of Jewish scholars as prominent members of the profession. The larger point is that social diversity introduced new questions and sensibilities that pushed along a fruitful intellectual debate. A similar point emerges when considering women and African-Americans as newly visible actors in the historical profession.

The bottom line is the faculty diversity matters, as a legitimate part of the College's teaching mission and responsibility, and as a factor that stimulates intellectual sharpening and excellence. Faculty diversity is generative of new fields or subfields, too, and is in this sense a vital source of intellectual energy and creativity. Universities already recognize several forms of diversity as obviously necessary and important forces for a vibrant intellectual life.

Research Activities

To build a solid knowledge foundation for reflection and advice, the EDC engaged in extensive information gathering, research, and consultation activities in 2006-2007. These activities encompassed five main areas.

First, we reviewed pertinent and readily available campus-wide data and documents related to ethnic and gender diversity. These included the 2005-2006 UW-Madison Data Digest, the Committee on Women in the University Annual Report of 2004-2006, the 2005 Final Report of the Ethnic Studies Implementation Committee, and the 2006 Study of Faculty Worklife by WISELI (Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute).

Second, with the generous collaboration of the Academic Planning Office and WISELI, we requested *new* data that homed in specifically on the College of Letters and Science, and that enabled us to disaggregate or otherwise refine data. The new data sets included College faculty head counts and tenure rates by race/ethnicity and by gender, and a special WISELI report on College faculty climate and work life. To view the new data and synthetic summary analyses directly, please go to the EDC Dossier, Items A1, A2, B1, and B2. We are especially grateful to Margaret Harrigan of Academic Planning and Jennifer Sheridan of WISELI for their generosity and intelligence in responding to requests for new data sets and a College climate report.

Third, to avoid an insular perspective based only on UW-Madison data and experience, the EDC organized an extensive reading packet (n = 74 items) of national level reports, research, and documents, and additional documents and articles, as relevant, throughout the academic year. Items reviewed included educational news articles in media such as *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Science*, research articles in journals, professional society studies or surveys, and task force reports by peer universities (University of California System, University of California-Davis, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, and University of Minnesota-Twin Cities). Professional society studies included the notable 2006 national survey of 4,500 tenure track faculty by

COACHE (The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education), housed at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. (One may find the survey and a related September 2006 press release by going to www.coache.org/reports.) We also sent a delegate to a national diversity conference held at the University of Minnesota.

Fourth, the EDC engaged in extensive consultation and information gathering within the campus community. Particularly valuable were four focus groups (n = 84 attendees), held by joint invitation to the College faculty by Dean Sandefur and Steve Stern on behalf of the EDC during the 2006-2007 academic year. Notes from the four focus groups are available in the EDC Dossier, Item C). Some recommendations below emerged directly from the focus group participants, while other ideas were refined (or rejected) as a result of the focus group process. EDC members also sought advice, information, and experience by meeting individually with campus and College leaders, with faculty and staff, and with persons holding specialized knowledge through work with Administrative Legal Service, WISELI, and the Women's Faculty Mentoring Program.

Fifth, to track and organize the vast array of information and advice under consideration, the EDC built tracking and annotation documents. These helped us cluster and compare information, feedback, and ideas, and included an "Executive Summary and Finders Guide" for our packet on national news, research, and reports (see EDC Dossier, Item D).

These five streams of information and analysis helped us understand the College diversity challenge, to place it in a wider national perspective, and to generate and refine practical ideas for improvement. We invite our colleagues to review much useful data and draw conclusions of their own by perusing the Dossier directly.

Key Findings

We summarize here three key findings that helped us diagnose how far we have come and how far we have to go. In order of presentation below, they are especially relevant to the three domains of our work: searches/recruitment, mentoring for tenure, and professional development. We elaborate on additional findings or other pertinent aspects in the "discussion" sections that follow each recommendation. The data cited below are all available in the Dossier, especially in the "A" and "B" sections.

A first finding is that College faculty head counts show a mixed picture: progress and fragility. The College faculty's racial/ethnic diversity and gender diversity have increased over time, but the rate of progress has been too slow and uneven to achieve "critical mass" for most faculty communities of color. One might describe this mixed result as a glass half-full versus glass half-empty situation, but with the added concern of knowing that the glass leaks and is not easily replenished.

On the one hand, the College has made tangible progress in the presence of minority faculty and women faculty, both in absolute numbers and percentage rates during 1997-2005. In 2005, College faculty amounted to 17.3% minority and 31.6% women, up from 11.3% and 25.7%, respectively, in 1997. On the other hand, the aggregate faculty-of-color percentages are misleading, if taken as a simple proxy for under-represented groups or as a sign of across-the-board progress. The Asian ethnic heritage category (9.2% in 2005, up from 5.7% in 1997) accounts for the majority of the increase. It includes but is not limited to under-represented subgroups. The other three faculty of color groups are Black (3.1% in 2005, up from 2.5%), Native American (0.6%, up from 0.2%), and Hispanic (4.4%, up from 3.0%). Considered together, these three under-represented groups amounted to 8.1% of College faculty in 2005, up from 5.7% in 1997.

(The campus-wide faculty head counts in 2005 were 15.1% minority, and 6.3% under-represented faculty-of-color groups excluding Asian ethnic heritage, inferior to the College rates of 17.3% and 8.1%, respectively. The campus-wide head count for women in 2005 was 38.5%, superior to the College rate of 25.7%.)

In other words, the College faculty head count data between 1997 and 2005 show a mixed result. Progress in ethnic and gender diversity is possible and has occurred – a promising achievement as far as it goes. But progress has also been uneven and fragile among under-represented faculty of color groups.

The fragility of progress and critical mass comes through in the absolute numbers. College minority faculty increased overall from 96 to 154 professors, and women faculty from 217 to 281 professors. During the same period, total College faculty increased more slowly, from 846 to 889. The disaggregated College head counts for faculty-of-color groups, however, show modest base lines and lack of critical mass in some cases. In 2005, the College faculty included only 28 African-Americans (up from 21 in 1997), only 39 Hispanics (up from 25), and only 5 Native Americans (up from 2). The Asian American presence was stronger, 82 faculty (up from 48).

Women-of-color headcounts also revealed very modest 1997 base lines, and peer groups that remained small in 2005. Women of color numbered 55 in 2005, far more than the 28 in 1997. But all the disaggregated under-represented groups were very small: African-American women numbered 12 (up from 9), Hispanic women 17 (up from 8), Native American women 2 (up from 1), and Asian American women 24 (up from 10).

In sum, the College has made tangible progress in the diversity profile of its faculty, but there is no cause for complacency. On the contrary, there is cause for concern about critical mass, especially when disaggregate figures are considered.

A second finding is that a large and disturbing gap appears in promotion-to-tenure rates of faculty women of color. To understand the gap, it is important to take account of four methodological aspects. (a) The available measures of tenure rates

consider *all* sources of attrition – denial of tenure, *and* tenure clock extensions, *and* resignations before tenure consideration. (b) There are two standard measures of tenure rates – rates of promotion to tenure within six years, and rates within nine years. The latter measure is important as a marker of medium-range retention of probationary faculty, and to take account of factors such as leaves or tenure clock extensions for medical or family care reasons. (c) The small size of women faculty-of-color cohorts means that the figures do not provide a statistically meaningful guide to trends over time in promotion rates of women-of-color cohorts. The cohorts are too small and fluctuating for meaningful comparison over time – for example, the two-year cohort of probationary faculty women of color hired in 1987-89 amounted to only 5, and the “cohort” of 1993-95 to only 1, while that of 1999-01 numbered 16. As a result, the analysis of six-year tenure rates is based on the cumulative rate for probationary cohorts hired during 1987-2001, and that of nine-year tenure rates is based on the cumulative rate for cohorts of 1987-1999. (d) The statistical finding of a large gap in the tenure rate for faculty women of color is consistent with the ethnographic evidence of recent years (including both direct knowledge of cases, and perceptions that circulate in faculty networks).

To set such tenure-rate patterns in context, it is also helpful to know that the overall College promotion-to-tenure rates are 50.3% for the six-year measure, and 65.4% for the nine-year measure. The gender pattern shows the significance of six-year versus nine-year measures. A very substantial gap appears in the six-year rate for women compared with men (42.0% versus 55.1%, respectively), and a significant but incomplete closing of the gap appears when considering the nine-year rate (60.8% versus 68.0%). The tenure rates of College men of color are in line with those of non-minority men in the six-year measure (55.0% versus 55.1%, respectively), although a small gap opens in the nine-year measure (63.6% versus 68.8%).

What stands apart strikingly and disturbs is the very large gap in the promotion rates of College faculty women of color. ***The cumulative six-year tenure rate for faculty women of color (n = 45) is only 33.3%. The result is a gap of over 20% compared to the ca. 55% six-year tenure rate of men (both majority and minority), and nearly 12% compared to the ca. 45% six-year rate of non-minority women.*** Even at the nine-year measure, when the tenure rate for faculty women of color rises to 44.8%, the gap remains large and indeed increases – to about 23% compared to men, and about 20% compared to non-minority women.

In sum, the College’s ability to tenure and retain faculty women of color has been very weak compared to its ability to do so with men (both majority and minority), and with white women. A caveat is that the analysis undertaken here cannot measure what has happened or will happen in the tenure rates of more recently hired women-of-color cohorts, nor the effects of the state’s fiscal crisis of recent years on comparative tenure and retention rates of probationary faculty. The ethnographic evidence of recent years, however, is consistent with the gap in the cumulative statistics of cohorts hired during 1987-2001, and suggests that one should not assume that the tenure rate gap will disappear naturally. The attrition of faculty women of color is a stark example of the “leaking glass” phenomenon, and also a reminder that issues of climate, critical mass, and

mentoring and professional development will be critical if the College is to improve faculty diversity in the long run.

A third finding is that the climate of interaction, engagement, and respect in the faculty workplace matters, and that the experiences of climate by four faculty groups (as studied in the 2006 College study by WISELI) merit special concern. These groups are women faculty, faculty of color, Humanities faculty, and non-mainstream faculty. The “non-mainstream” group is self-reported and refers to perception of the faculty member’s research within the home department. (The survey statement was, “In my department, I feel that my research is considered mainstream.”)

To set the findings in a wider context, the 2006 COACHE survey of national tenure-track faculty is useful. The COACHE survey found that for the current generation of tenure-track faculty, in contrast to previous generations, collegiality (the word COACHE used as a gloss for “climate, culture, and collegiality”) turned out by far to be the top variable predicting faculty job satisfaction. This finding held true (albeit to different degrees) for all groups – women as well as men, faculty of color as well as white faculty. The connection of climate and job satisfaction contrasted with findings for earlier faculty generations, for whom autonomy was the great attraction. The current generation values autonomy, but not isolation to do one’s work alone. It places greater relative weight, when considering job satisfaction, on the quality of relationships – intellectual engagement and collaboration, professional and personal interaction, fairness of evaluation, connection with a sense of community.

The implication for universities is that climate is central rather than marginal to intellectual vitality – and to strategic thinking about recruitment and retention of future generations of senior faculty.

Against this backdrop, the results for College faculty in the 2006 climate study by WISELI revealed areas of concern related to faculty diversity. Some of the results may be seen as positive or promising. (For the report and the tables referenced below, see the EDC Dossier, Items in the “B” section.) For example, large majorities of all faculty groups reported (at rates over 80%) that their faculty colleagues and department chairs treated them with respect. In addition, white faculty and male faculty appeared to be more concerned about climate issues in 2006 compared to 2003. The share of men who believed the departmental climate “good” for women declined somewhat. So did the share of majority faculty who thought the departmental climate “good” for faculty of color.

Despite these and other positive aspects, the study also revealed differentiated experiences of climate – more negative for faculty women, faculty of color, Humanities faculty, and non-mainstream faculty. We invite our colleague to peruse the data in the report directly. Here we mention two examples that raise concerns about effective voice and involvement as faculty citizens of an engaged collegial community. Reported feelings of isolation in one’s home department (Table PI4) are higher for women

compared to men, for faculty of color compared to majority faculty – and by a very dramatic margin, for non-mainstream faculty compared to mainstream colleagues (53.1% versus 12.0%, respectively). A major gap also occurs in reported reluctance to raise concerns related to behavior of department colleagues “for fear it might affect my reputation or advancement” (Table PI2). As one might expect, untenured faculty experience more inhibition compared to tenured faculty (38.8% compared to 25.6%, respectively). More striking and surprising, perhaps, is the pattern of differentiated inhibition by gender, ethnicity, and non-mainstream status. Women, faculty of color, and non-mainstream faculty all report reluctance to bring up issues at virtually the same rates as untenured faculty (39.9%, 38.8%, 37.1%, respectively). Male faculty and majority faculty report much less inhibition (22.6% and 27.7%, respectively).

Non-mainstream faculty are people who define their knowledge fields, whether subfields within a discipline or interdisciplinary knowledge fields that cut across disciplines, as research that runs against the grain of what is considered mainstream in home departments. The non-mainstream group turns out to be important in the measures of respect, informal department interaction, and isolation perceived by faculty.

Who are the non-mainstream faculty? When considering its composition, an outlier phenomenon comes into view and bears an important relationship to diversity. As one might expect, since universities are cultures that take pride in the creation of original knowledge, self-reporting as non-mainstream is high for the College faculty as a whole (42.5%). Universities embrace people who define themselves as mavericks, and people who challenge conventional wisdom are drawn to university life! Nonetheless, white male faculty responses stand apart. Less than two in five (only 36.6%) think their research non-mainstream, compared to half for white women (49.0%) and over half for faculty of color (55.1%, with no significant difference by gender). For Humanities faculty as a whole, the self-reported non-mainstream faculty was also very large (50.6%).

In sum, within home departments, experiences of social isolation and lack of a community of engaged intellectual peers are relatively higher for faculty of color and women faculty, and for two overlapping groups, non-mainstream and Humanities scholars. Strategic thinking about mentoring, professional development, and retention is more effective if it takes into account climate, and if it considers the role of cross-departmental interaction and culture in building communities of social and intellectual engagement.

Recommendations (I): Searches and Recruitment

We have four recommendations in this area. *Create a designated-resources fund to enhance diversity and excellence in the College; adopt a continuous best-practice model of faculty-dean collaboration in the search process; promote a wise and sustainable target-of-opportunity policy; invite departments and academic programs to develop diversity plans.* Each recommendation is described and discussed below.

Recommendation #1:

Create a designated-resources fund, such as a College “Strategic Excellence Fund,” for faculty hiring that enhances diversity and excellence in the College as a whole.

Discussion:

The name “strategic excellence fund” is less important than the concept of a designated-resources fund. This would be a hiring fund set aside by the Dean for strategic improvement of the quality of the College over the medium run, in accord with College priorities and emerging twenty-first century needs. A central College priority would be improvement of the diversity of its faculty, but the fund would also facilitate responsiveness to other critical priorities – for example, hires in subfields of emerging knowledge for which there has not yet crystallized a “ready-made” constituency through routine replacement oriented requests by departments. One may think of the analogy of an economic savings rate. Just as an economy may need a 20% savings rate in order to achieve healthy sustained growth and dynamism in the long run, so it is that a College needs a fund to invest strategically in faculty and fields that will strengthen the College’s quality and responsiveness to a twenty-first century society.

The creation of a designated-resources fund for which improvement of diversity is a central priority would not diminish the importance of improved practices related to diversity in more “routine” searches. *See recommendation #2* below on a continuous best-practice approach. At the same time, however, the existence of a designated-resources fund would help render more feasible and practical the target-of-opportunity policy discussed below. *See recommendation #3* below.

Recommendation #2:

Adopt a continuous best-practice approach at each strategic checkpoint in the search process where deans and departments collaborate.

Discussion:

For the specific elements of a continuous best-practice approach, see Appendix A. There are several strategic points in the search process where revised practices by all of us – at the level of deans and administrators, as well as faculty and departments – could improve the probabilities of outcomes that enhance diversity as well as excellence. Adopting improved practices on the part of all key actors at specific strategic checkpoints is a good way, too, to build a sense of partnership and shared effort by deans and faculty.

Recommendation #3:

Promote a wise and sustainable target of opportunity policy. Define and publicize a target-of-opportunity policy – precisely what a target of opportunity means and does not mean – and the availability of funding for such appointments.

Discussion:

For legal aspects for a sustainable and well defined target-of-opportunity policy, and its relationship to a designated-resources fund, see Appendix B (notes from meeting of Gary Sandefur and Steve Stern with Chuck Hoornstra). We do not currently have a well defined target-of-opportunity policy – at least not one well understood by faculty and chairs. Indeed, there is considerable confusion in the campus faculty culture about whether such a policy exists and if so, what it means.

Recommendation #4:

Invite departments and academic programs to develop, in collaboration with their academic associate deans, diversity plans, and announce that such plans and their effectiveness will be taken into serious consideration when making decisions about faculty search requests.

Discussion: The writing of a diversity plan would be a voluntary decision, undertaken in response to the Dean’s invitation. This approach recognizes that size and turnover of faculty, Ph.D. pipeline issues related to under-representation, and other aspects vary by unit, and that grass roots decisions to build diversity plans are more effective and collegial than across-the-board requirements. At the same time, announcing that the College will take such plans into serious consideration when making decisions on faculty search requests indicates that improvement of diversity is a major priority.

A diversity plan is most useful if it considers a medium-run horizon (for example, four years), builds in periodic assessment of progress, and is based on specific analysis of challenges and opportunities. Among the interrelated themes worth addressing are: (a) identification of subfields of knowledge that have unusual promise from the standpoint of building strong ethnic or gender diversity in the applicant pool, and that are also of strong intellectual need and interest to the department; (b) analysis of the nature of the PhD pipeline relevant to the department and discipline, from the point of view of racial/ethnic and gender diversity, and strategies for optimal and realistic tapping of the pipeline; (c) analysis of gender or racial/ethnic under-representation in the department that takes into account pipeline issues; and (d) creation of a proposal that specifically builds on the items above (the “knowledge items” related to challenge and opportunity) to improve the diversity of the department faculty within the medium run.

Recommendations (II): Mentoring for Tenure

We have three recommendations in this area. *Adopt interdisciplinary best-practices to align criteria for tenure with criteria for hire, in select cases, as warranted by the knowledge field or appointment; create community mentoring initiatives to supplement one-on-one mentoring; build in a semester of paid research leave for newly appointed probationary professors.* Each recommendation is described and discussed below.

Recommendation #1:

Adopt interdisciplinary best-practices to align criteria for tenure with criteria for hire, in select cases as warranted by cross-unit (inter-disciplinary) appointments or by the non-mainstream field of knowledge:

(a) *Appoint organically integrated cross-unit probationary review committees and tenure review committees*, and stipulate the integrated cross-unit reviews in the language of the initial appointment letter of the probationary faculty;

(b) *In the tenure decision year, explicitly orient the relevant Divisional Committee* about the cross-disciplinary or non-mainstream nature of the appointment or field of knowledge, and the appointment field's criteria for assessing excellence.

Discussion:

In the applicable cases, the initial letter of appointment would also stipulate that all members of the cross-unit review committees would have the right to be present in the discussion of the probationary and tenure review reports to the Executive Committee of the tenure home department of the assistant professor. The letter would also state, of course, that only tenured members of the home department can vote on a motion at the Executive Committee meeting.

The orientation of the appropriate Divisional Committee would need to include explicit discussion of the cross-disciplinary (or non-mainstream) hiring field in the appropriate documents – the tenure dossier's cover letter, and its assessments of research, teaching, and service; and if relevant, communications from the Office of the Dean.

Aligning criteria for tenure with criteria for hire is indispensable for effective mentoring and preparation for tenure, and the issue has affected faculty of color disproportionately.

In reviewing candidates for tenure and orienting the Divisional Committee about the specific nature of research and teaching fields, tenure home departments should, in appropriate cases, be mindful about widespread experience of lower student evaluation

scores in courses that fulfill the Ethnic Studies requirement, compared to other courses. (For further orientation on this issue, see the 2005 Final Report of the Ethnic Studies Implementation Committee.)

Recommendation #2:

Create community mentoring initiatives to supplement one-on-one mentoring within departments, and including the following elements:

(a) *mentoring workshops to “mentor the mentors”* on challenges and responsibilities and rewards of one-on-one mentoring; and,

(b) *community mentoring events* (such as breakfasts, lunches, or afternoon teas) that orient new faculty to practical information, challenges, and opportunities relevant to successful campus careers and professional development; that address special challenges faced by faculty of color; and that create a climate of informal sociability, networking, and community discussion that can help junior faculty identify additional informal mentors.

Discussion:

The point is to supplement and enhance departmental one-on-one mentoring, not to displace it, and to do so in ways that enhance successful mentoring and retention of faculty of color while improving opportunities for all faculty.

It is also understood that new mentoring programs to improve tenure and retention rates for faculty of color would not displace the campus program for mentoring women faculty, but would collaborate, coordinate, and learn from it.

Mentoring the mentors is important, since one-on-one mentoring relationships can be a hit-or-miss proposition and can be frustrating for mentors as well as mentees.

Recommendation #3:

Build in one semester of paid research leave (release from teaching) for all newly appointed probationary professors, and encourage the assistant professors to use the semester as a base, if needed, to build a full year of research leave with assistance of complementary external grants.

Discussion:

The campus is not competitive in the academic marketplace in this regard, and even less so in competing for talented faculty of color. The lack of sufficient research

support was a sore point in focus group discussion (see especially focus group 4), and harms the retention as well as recruitment climate for faculty of color.

A duty of the faculty mentor would be to help the probationary faculty member, if she or he wishes, to build an effective research grant strategy to convert one semester of guaranteed support into a year of support with assistance of additional grants.

This is a classic example of an important point. Measures taken to enhance the success and professional development of faculty of color often are improved practices that benefit all faculty, majority as well as minority.

Recommendations (III): Professional Development

We have two recommendations in this area. *Create an institute on ethnicity, indigeneity, and race in comparative perspective to support research and foster professional development; create awards, both to individuals and academic units collectively, for outstanding achievement contributing to diversity.* Each recommendation is described and discussed below.

Recommendation #1:

Create an institute (or research center) that provides College faculty residential fellowships to support research on ethnicity, indigeneity, and race in comparative perspective (U.S. and international), to foster professional development related to diversity in three fundamental ways:

- (a) support of research excellence on diversity themes, through paid semesters with teaching release;
- (b) build comparative intellectual engagement and synergies among campus scholars who analyze such themes from the perspective of different disciplines, racial/ethnic groups, and world regions; and,
- (c) foster intellectual critical mass and community, by building a research home where scholars who work on diversity related themes can “find and engage” and learn from one another, thereby enhancing professional development and sinking roots even if few colleagues in their home departments work on similar issues.

Discussion:

The core mission and design of the institute, as summarized above, is clearly differentiated from the mission and design of the UW System Institute housed in Milwaukee. The College institute complements rather than duplicates the System program.

The lack of such an institute at UW-Madison renders us uncompetitive with peer universities. The institute or research center is important not only for professional development, but also the recruitment and retention climate in a tough academic marketplace.

The new institute or research center, to meet its mission, would need to pay special attention to community building and intellectual engagement – including mentoring of younger faculty, when appropriate – in the design of institute activity and climate. It would be expected that the institute would study and learn from best-practices, in this regard, at other institutes.

The College based faculty fellowships and related intellectual activity (e.g., research seminars, guest speaker events, mentoring workshops) would constitute the initial core, but one could envision new layers of connection and activity over time. For example, as external funding and central campus support permit, the center could eventually (1) establish more organic connections to non-College campus faculty who have similar or related interests; (2) build a program of post-doctoral fellowships and graduate dissertator fellowship; (3) serve as a stimulating intellectual home for new faculty who receive recruitment semester fellowships; (4) organize short-term visits by prominent “magnet scholars” who pull people into a community of discussion; and (5) create pools of PAship support related to diversity research.

Recommendation #2:

Create awards for outstanding achievement contributing to diversity, at both the individual level and the group level (academic programs or departments), and including the following elements:

- (a) ***a visible award ceremony*** that gathers people to honor the awardees and take notice of the value placed on diversity;
- (b) at the level of individual awardees, ***a combination of one-time prize and permanent salary base adjustment***, modeled on the material aspect of the campus outstanding teaching awards;
- (c) at the level of group awardees (academic program or department), ***provision of highly valued resources such as a modest PAship bank*** (pool of “x” PAships, expendable within “y” number of years).

Discussion:

The point here is to create the symbolism and the material rewards that together signify serious commitment to diversity, build new incentives to engage the diversity-enhancement process, and properly reward outstanding performance. The diversity

excellence awards adds a College component to the basket of campus rewards – such as the Distinguished Teaching Awards and Hilldale Award – by which we take note of outstanding performance related to campus values and mission. (Ideally and in the long run, central campus should consider organizing and supporting such awards, but the College can set the example and lead the process.)

Outstanding group achievement enhancing diversity would be construed broadly rather than narrowly, to include the full range of activities that may be pertinent. It might refer to advances in faculty hiring and research fields, teaching and development of curriculum, mentoring of communities of color including faculty, staff, or students, and so on.

By creating group awards to academic departments and programs, not just individual awards, the new diversity award program would also serve two additional functions. It would honor the *community* aspect of diversity, a value important to many faculty of color and communities of color. It would also reinforce an important point. New initiatives to improve the diversity climate, and retention and professional development of faculty of color, actually create new practices to everyone's benefit.

Envisioning the College in 2020: Faculty Diversity and Excellence

The College of Letters and Science is the heart and soul of the UW-Madison. Its professors teach most of the university's undergraduates, who in turn become the leaders and citizens of tomorrow; mentor most of the university's doctoral students, who will replenish the national professoriate and inspire new generations of undergraduates; and create new research knowledge, original enough to transform how we think within and across the disciplines, and even create new fields. The College's professors perform all these functions, in collaboration with staff as well as students, while collectively embracing the full array of scientific, social science, and humanities and artistic sensibilities that define human intellect and experience, and embracing, too, the ethos of public service.

The synergies of research, teaching, and service at the heart of the mission of a great public university, committed to serving a wide variety of students, prompt a question. In two tenure cycles or three undergraduate degree cycles, the nation will complete its 2020 census and will once more discover how profoundly diverse is our national citizenry. Will our faculty also have grown more diverse? Does the answer matter? If so, what practices do we need to adopt today to create the tomorrow of diversity and excellence?

Faculty diversity in the broad sense – knowledge fields, generations, socio-cultural backgrounds – is an important component and catalyst of intellectual excellence. Too much sameness breeds insularity and mediocrity. This is why great university communities often embrace maverick thinkers in their midst, welcome international as

well as national scholars, and strive for a mix of generations in academic departments and programs. We gain in intellectual sharpness and we create new lines of inquiry when we bump up against minds informed by different experiences, research questions, and ways of knowing.

Here, then, is a vision that inspires us. We see today a College whose faculty welcomes a future of faculty diversity and excellence, has experienced some frustration in reaching that twin goal, and will welcome practical tools that improve our ability to reach it. Within two tenure cycles, by about 2020, we see a College whose improved ability to recruit talented faculty of color and faculty women into its professoriate created a sustained upward trend line in faculty diversity. We see a College that eliminated the gap that once marked its ability to mentor, tenure, and retain women faculty of color, and in the process built improved support for all probationary faculty. We see a College whose professional development opportunities nurtured intellectual engagement and community among scholars whose research deepens our understanding of ethnicity, indigeneity, and race, and whose forms of recognizing outstanding achievement place value on diversity as well as other accomplishments. We see a College where faculty diversity and excellence go hand in hand, and seem so natural that students need to take a history course if they wish to understand why it was not always so.

**Appendix A:
Specific Elements of a Continuous Best-Practice Approach to Diversity in Searches**

We recommend adoption of a “continuous best-practice” approach *at each strategic checkpoint* in the search process where deans and departments collaborate.

Continuous best-practice means that faculty and deans explicitly consider improvement of diversity as one important goal at every checkpoint, and that they adopt specific practices to improve the probabilities of making an excellent appointment that also contributes to diversity.

The specific revised procedures by deans and departments to achieve a continuous best-practice approach would include the following elements.

(a) *At the pre-authorization stage*, where the Dean discusses overall policies with Chairs and Directors, the Dean would make a statement of incentives. The Dean would announce that as a matter of College policy and as part of a wider package of diversity initiatives, the College “will take progress on diversity into account when considering requests by departments for faculty hiring positions.”

Discussion:

As part of public leadership and engagement of faculty, departments, and chairs and directors on diversity as a reachable priority, it will be important for College deans to promote the idea that we are committed to a culture of accountability and reward. (In principle, accountability, reward, and incentive are important for all priorities.) This means that as it allocates resources and responds to needs, the College intends to reward and encourage rather than penalize units that are innovative, cooperative, and successful in improving faculty diversity.

(b) *At the initial stage of authorizing searches*, consider explicitly how the definition of an approved field – not just the field chosen, but also the specific language that defines the field intellectually for an ad or posting – affects the likelihood of building a diverse pool of applicants. *For select cases, point (c) below is also relevant at the initial stage.*

Discussion:

**At this stage, it is important to think of diversity in its broad sense – the interplays that occur between who is hired, what fields and curriculum are approved as priorities, how the specific intellectual definition of a search field may affect the pool of applicants.

**In select fields and very select cases (given budgetary constraints), organize a two-year search process, with advance approval of the search by the College – a first year of informal creation of pipeline knowledge, the second the year of the search itself. *“Hard” pre-authorization is necessary if this strategy is to be effective.*

(c) *In select cases, also at the initial stage of authorizing searches*, create organic cross-unit search committees, and promote cross-unit communication in other appropriate cases.

Discussion:

One aspect of this policy is to build organically integrated cross-unit search committees from the start, in cases where the nature of the contemplated position makes this appropriate. Another aspect – more subtle, but also important – is to promote more timely communication with relevant units, even for appointments defined as 100% within a single unit, to help build diverse applicant pools and to create a broader environment of welcome and interest when finalists arrive for campus visits.

(d) *In the early search phase*, when building a strong applicant pool is important, improve search committee workshops and College staff assistance related to diversity in two ways:

****build “pipeline knowledge” assistance from the College; and,
include academic associate deans actively in the workshops, organized by division.

Discussion:

The current workshops do a fine job of educating people on diversity issues in searches, but as yet do not help with practical pipeline knowledge. Nor do they incorporate academic associate deans as partners actively involved with departments in discussing and improving diversity practice. In focus groups and in the literature we have reviewed, pipeline knowledge issues are crucial and faculty believe they need much more practical support. The College could build, for modest cost, a clearing house of information and data bases on faculty and graduate students of color, women faculty and graduate students. More generally, it is important to involve academic associate deans more actively as partners in building a search culture more effective on diversity issues, and for the Dean of the College to make such contributions an expectation of the job.

(e) *In the late phase of junior searches*, academic associate deans should ask departments to explain the intellectual merits of the “top four” finalists for a potential campus visit, rather than ask for a profile of only the “top two.”

Discussion:

At the junior level, scholarly track records are short compared to those in senior searches. One is betting on the likely future. It is not always clear – in advance of the campus visit itself – if there is a quality distinction, for example, between candidate number “two” and candidate number “three.” Such discussions are also helpful because they make clear that strong effort related to diversity is one important goal and expectation in searches, and that if necessary to broaden the pool of finalist visitors to campus, additional campus visit funds will be available.

(f) *In addition, the College would undertake an examination of its own internal best-practices related to diversity and searches, and create College-run best-practices workshops on faculty searches and diversity.*

Discussion: By examining its own best-practice culture and having associate deans take a more direct responsibility for organizing well thought out search workshops that highlight best-practices including those that enhance diversity, the College can create more organic partnerships between deans and departments. It can also improve prospects for incorporating best-practices into College and departmental cultures. At the same time, the College can build on the valuable experience and knowledge of WISELI (on issues such as building a diverse applicant pool, and research on unconscious bias) as it organizes College-run workshops on searches.

**Appendix B:
Notes on Legal Aspects of Target-of-Opportunity, Diversity, and Searches.**

These notes on legal issues related to diversity and searches are from a meeting held on 28-II-07 with Chuck Hoorstra, Administrative Legal Services, at the request of Gary Sandefur and Steve Stern. The notes were reviewed for legal accuracy by CH.

Guidelines and Examples of Scenarios:

Bearing in mind recent Supreme Court rulings on student admissions and the University of Michigan, and their implication for faculty searches and diversity, here are some guidelines about what is legally defensible and sustainable policy. (The context is the working assumption that any policies developed would also be wise and defensible in substantive and ethical terms, but the focus here is on the legal aspect.)

1. The overall principle: one legitimate consideration among several.

Legally, race/ethnicity cannot be a litmus-test factor – the one key variable – in decisions to admit students, hire faculty, and the like. At the same time, it *can* be one legitimate interest and consideration among others to accomplish the mission of the university. In student admission cases, the focus is on pedagogical mission.

In faculty hiring cases, legitimate needs related to the university's pedagogical and research mission may include improvement of the diversity of the teaching faculty, and hiring in emerging (not yet mainstream) intellectual fields important to improve the future quality of the university, but that might not otherwise make it to the top of routine replacement oriented requests for searches by departments in tight times. Use of a designated-resources fund to achieve such goals is legitimate.

2. Practice: what is permitted and what is not.

How does this principle translate into what is legitimate and not legitimate in the uses of a designated fund and a target-of-opportunity method for hires contributing to diversity? We used a case method of scenarios to sort this out. The background assumption is that the field of hire is an area of legitimate priority, important to the future quality of the department, College, or university.

(a) The allowable:

**A straightforward case:

Professor X is a mature associate or young full professor – in other words, has a track record of scholarly accomplishment that enables one to compare her (or him) with generational peers in her field. A department shows that Professor X is the best in the field in that generation – mature associates and recently promoted full – and asks for a

waiver of open search, since a search would be pointless. It seeks permission to bring the candidate to campus for interview and possible hire. *Outcome: permissible.*

**A gray zone case:

Professor Y is so brilliant that she (or he) emerged as one of the top three candidates in a junior search, even though the “fit of field” was awkward or questionable in the search. In addition, Professor Y emerged as the top candidate in searches with a better field fit by peer universities. In addition, Professor Y came to UW-Madison for a lecture visit and her UW-Madison colleagues came away convinced that she is a young “star” in the making. Based on these facts, the department believes there is a prima facie case that she would rise to the top as a star candidate and be invited to campus for interview in an open search, if the fit of field were appropriate. It therefore requests waiver of an open search and permission to bring her to campus for interview and possible hire. *Outcome: permissible.*

(b) Not allowable:

A department or program has identified a very fine scholar who is a person of color. It requests permission to bring the candidate to campus for interview and possible hire without an open search. Its argument amounts to the idea that “Here’s a good scholar of color whom we’d like to hire.” It has not established a credible case that this person is at the top of her or his field within the appropriate generational cohort. *Outcome: not permissible.*

3. The bottom line.

A well thought out designated-resources fund is allowable, and a well thought out policy of target-of-opportunity hires is also allowable, to promote diversity as one legitimate consideration among others in advancing the university’s mission. *Both* the straightforward case and the gray zone case above establish rationales to waive an open search. This becomes even more the case if there also enters a time-sensitive element in which it is important not to let an opportunity grow “cold.”

Caveat: The straightforward case scenario above is the “easiest” for the Academic Personnel Office. One has to work harder to build the gray-zone case.