Improving Faculty Recruitment and Retention at the University of Rochester

A Diversity and Inclusion Initiative

Lynne Davidson
Former Deputy to the President
Former Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity

Frederick Jefferson
Professor Emeritus, Warner School
University Intercessor

Carol Shuherk
Senior Associate Provost

November 22, 2009

Introduction

The University of Rochester's Faculty Diversity Initiative began in January 2007, charged with implementing the 31 recommendations of the 2006 Report of the Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness. Most significantly, this initiative has established a robust assessment program; increased resources, visibility, and usage of the Special Opportunities Fund; and fostered the spread of best practices that support hiring and retaining a more diverse faculty (see Appendix 1 for status of the 31 recommendations and descriptions of achievements).

In fall 2008, the Office for Faculty Development and Diversity launched an evaluation process aimed at gathering feedback on the state of our diversity initiative and suggestions for next steps. The process included three-parts: a listening tour, town hall meetings, and a reconvening of the 2006 Task Force. The discussion and recommendations that follow are based on what we learned in all three settings. They are dominated, however, by the findings of the listening tour, the most substantial of the three processes.

Listening Tour Process: Between October 2008 and May 2009, Vice Provost Lynne Davidson, Intercessor Frederick Jefferson, and Senior Associate Provost Carol Shuherk met with 94 faculty members, from all of the University's six schools, in sixty to ninety minute conversations. The 94 represent those responding affirmatively to 137 invitations extended to faculty university-wide (see table below). Thirty-six of the 137 were chosen randomly; the remaining 101 invitations were extended to individuals based on their membership in a demographic group we considered underrepresented in their department or school. We defined "underrepresented" to include women in engineering, sciences, and business; men in nursing; African Americans, Hispanics or Latinos, and Native Americans throughout the University; and Asians in parts of the University. Eighty-two of the 94 faculty are tenured or tenure-track faculty.

We did not view the listening tour as a climate survey, and so did not employ statistical sampling methods. Rather, we saw the meetings as opportunities to generate ideas for new or improved processes and policies that would create a more diverse and inclusive environment for UR faculty. With that goal in mind, we thought it appropriate to oversample underrepresented faculty.

Number of Invited and Participating Faculty

	Underrepresented	Random Sample	Total
Invited	101	36	137
Participated	71	23	94

Of the 94 faculty with whom we met, 62 spoke with us individually and 32 met with us in 13 separate group meetings of two to four people. All were offered the choice of meeting with Lynne, Frederick, or Carol separately, or with the three of us as a group. If a faculty member expressed no preference (97% did not) all three of us tried to be available for the conversation.

Participants received invitation letters via email, explaining that we would be talking about faculty recruitment and retention and that our conversations would be confidential (see Appendix 2 for a sample invitation).

Town Hall Meetings: Between February and April 2009, Provost Ralph Kuncl hosted three diversity town hall meetings – one each on the River Campus, in the Medical Center, and at the Eastman School of Music. These meetings were advertised in @Rochester and *Faculty Development News*, and open to the entire University community. They were billed as an opportunity for faculty, staff, and students to offer suggestions to those responsible for implementing our faculty diversity initiative. Attendance at the River Campus and Medical Center meetings was low; however, both provided feedback that is incorporated into this report. The Eastman School meeting was focused both broadly and on issues very specific to Eastman. Their Diversity Committee is following up as appropriate.

Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness: On February 4th 2009, President Seligman and Provost Kuncl hosted a dinner conversation with the authors of the 2006 Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness Task Force Report. This gave the originators of our initiative the opportunity to offer their thoughts about the direction it has taken, and make suggestions for moving forward. Again, their input is incorporated into this report.

Our Focus

The recommendations that follow are based primarily on the data drawn from the discussions with faculty on the listening tour, but also incorporate ideas from the town hall meetings and the 2006 Task Force members.

While the process that led to this report was intended to generate ideas for practices and policies to better recruit and retain diverse faculty, the report is focused on retention. That is, its recommendations pay particular attention to how faculty are welcomed into the University community and supported professionally and personally. We think that a focus on retention will affect success in recruitment, as those we seek to attract are able to observe the success of those already here. We understand that focusing on retention may appear to ignore the fact that some academic units of the University have few, if any, underrepresented faculty to retain; but we wish to dispel any notion that because of our small numbers, the University of Rochester should focus on recruitment <u>rather than</u> retention. The listening tour has convinced us that recruitment and retention are synergistic processes, that can and should be addressed simultaneously, and that special focus on retention is appropriate at this time.

This message was driven home by the faculty with whom we spoke on our listening tour. While we acknowledge that a focus on retention was somewhat inevitable, given that our conversations were with faculty already on campus, the message about retention's impact on recruitment was too powerful to ignore.

Illustrating Faculty Experience via Case Scenarios

Although we set out to seek advice for improving University policies and practices in order to better recruit and retain underrepresented faculty, the 94 listening tour interviews often centered on stories of individual experience – how those with whom we spoke recalled joining the University of Rochester faculty, experienced the pursuit of their careers here, and view their lives here today. That is, most faculty spoke to their own experience as a way to help us better define the problems we are trying to solve. As a result, the body of data that has been gathered is deeply personal in nature, 94 separate stories of being recruited, starting to work, and getting along in this particular academic community.

While these faculty experiences range across 50 different disciplines and all six University of Rochester schools, they have in common the innate aspects of organizational life: entering, acclimating, experiencing leadership, being evaluated, developing relationships, and emotionally reacting to a distinct organizational culture. On one hand, these faculty members' experiences are as infinitely unique as the "flavors" of working relationships that result from the intersection of differing personalities. On the other hand, participants in the study share with each other the years-long experience of uncertainty unique to academic life: "Will I be tenured? Will it be up or out for me?" And because this particular study focused on underrepresented faculty[1], its participants' experiences reflect both their unique work environments and the broad commonalities and inherent disadvantages of academic life lived in the minority, described first in Joann Moody's seminal text, *Faculty diversity: problems and solutions*, and as well by University of Rochester faculty in the listening tour.

Person-by-person reviews of the 94 interviews yielded thirteen separate themes of experience (enumerated below) that arc across disciplines and schools and which have particular impact on underrepresented faculty. In turn, these themes can be clustered beneath four broad "constants" operating, in disparate ways, in all organizations:

1) Development: the professional support extended to faculty as they develop their careers.
2) Leadership: the direct and symbolic actions that align departments and their members with the university's vision and mission.
3) Personal Needs: the aspects of private life that are tied to a faculty member's ability to succeed in their careers.
4) Organizational Culture: the shared assumptions, norms, attitudes, and practices that characterize daily life in a particular environ.

These organizational qualities represent a four-dimensional lens through which the experience of any faculty member can be viewed. Placing the thirteen themes within the four "constants" lends focus and detail to the various aspects, good and bad, of underrepresented faculty's experience at the UR, viewed from within our organizational lens.

---

[1] We remind the reader that in this context, "underrepresented" includes women in engineering, sciences, and business; men in nursing; African American, Hispanic or Latino, and Native American throughout the University; and Asians in some parts of the University.

Development

√ Sufficient or insufficient mentoring

√ Extensive or limited cross-disciplinary opportunities

Leadership

√ Widespread or inconsistent welcoming and orienting processes

√ Adequate or inadequate level of contact with department chair

√ Transparency or lack of transparency in the promotion and tenure process

√ Reasonable or excessive responsibility for minority student mentoring

Personal Needs

√ Consistent or inconsistent support for dual career couples

√ Sufficient or insufficient communication of family friendly policies/processes

√ Adequate or inadequate day care support

Organizational Culture

√ An openness in recruitment or a "select schools only" entry bias

√ Appropriate or insufficient value placed on community based research

√ Good classroom environment or hostility in classroom environments/harshness in student evaluations

√ Sense of belonging or isolation and lack of a sense of community membership

To illustrate the way these themes can color the experience of underrepresented faculty and in keeping with the "personal stories" nature of the study, we developed three case scenarios, written to put a human face on the data for the reader. As with all case studies, these narratives illustrate, in condensed form, the interplay of multiple variables within a real life context. In order to illustrate, they weave into a single scenario more issues than may be experienced by a given individual, while stopping short of cataloguing all issues at work in a system on the other. Not used here as social science method or intended as a basis for generalization, these cases offer instead an opportunity to explore complex, multi-layered problems along practical lines and to raise questions of how, why and what can be changed. Taken together they offer a contextual view of the situation we face and a platform for discussion as we seek a holistic understanding of diversity and inclusion issues on our campus.

The three cases reflect a continuum of experience along which the University of Rochester's faculty from underrepresented groups might be placed. At one end is the "golden" experience, of receiving, on entry, an unmistakable message that "we're glad you're here and we want you to stay forever," followed by years of personal attention and support. On the other end is a kind of organizational unconsciousness, a complete absence of recognition by those who hold influence over faculty's experience of the differences between lives lived in the minority and those spent in the majority, with isolation, alienation, and despair the result. In the middle stands a person whose experience might be described as "one foot in; one foot still out," a graduate of the "right" schools, well prepared, high functioning, and yet still feeling distinctly apart: recipient of friendliness, but not close mentoring; moving steadily along a track, but not fully certain of being on a path to promotion. Each case is an amalgam of faculty experience at three distinct points along the continuum. None of the cases reflects the experience of any one person. They are presented here as food for thought, for introspection and for further exploration.

Note: None of the three case studies should be taken literally. The reader should not try to identify the people or the departments as neither exists in precisely this form.

Case Study #1: Connected, Supported and Flourishing

Dora is a third-year assistant professor in a science department preeminent in its field. Her partner Chet is also an academic and in the same discipline. Given the stature of her department, Dora had been somewhat surprised when she received an offer from the University of Rochester. She earned her Ph.D. from a large public university in the midwest and did a post-doc at a similar institution. Her mentors were solid scientists, but not nationally prominent. When she initially looked into the UR as an applicant she had been more than a little intimidated by the Ivy League pedigrees of so many of its faculty, university-wide. She had not thought her credentials would measure up. But when they extended their offer her UR colleagues made it clear that they believe Dora is headed for a stand out career. They lauded her innovative research questions and assured her that while her research methods are not typical of those used at the UR, they view them as not only scientifically sound but attractive for their distinctiveness. Her prospects for obtaining independent funding and making a unique contribution to the department's reputation are considered excellent.

When Dora came for her interview, she felt somewhat hesitant about mentioning the fact that her husband was also seeking an academic appointment, but decided to raise the issue upfront and deal with the potential fallout sooner rather than later. She knew there were other dual career couples in the department, so went into the conversation hoping that this family issue would not make her a less desirable candidate. To her immense relief, Chet received a phone call two days after Dora's interview inviting him to submit his CV. The department chair initiated a process introducing Chet and his work to the department faculty as well as others in related fields and after a bit of work and negotiation an agreement was reached including positions for both.

While both Dora and Chet are quick to say that the opportunity to do cutting edge work with world class colleagues and first rate students is the most rewarding aspect of being at Rochester, they also have been touched by the attention given to their personal experience here. Within two months of their arrival, they received no fewer than six invitations to dinner at colleagues' homes (three of which included their two young children). Throughout their first year department staff and faculty regularly stopped by their offices to see how they were settling in and to offer suggestions for good restaurants and family activities, as well as advice on day care, summer camps, and the best places to canoe (the family's favorite summer activity). At the end of their first academic year here they attended a department outing to a Red Wings game and that summer went on a winery tour organized for "early career" faculty.

Dora and Chet are expecting their third child this fall. They both have been offered modified duties for the coming semester. They also have been told that they will receive an additional year before their promotion review, although neither one expects to take it. Both were coached by department colleagues as they prepared their first grant proposals and their initial publication submissions. The department chair introduced Dora to a faculty member in a different science department, a woman who had begun her academic career at the UR and achieved tenure while raising two young children. Her insights have been invaluable to Dora's sense of how to balance work and family. When she attended the national association meetings as a UR faculty member for the first time a senior colleague invited her to join him for casual get-togethers with people including the most highly regarded scholar in her area, the association president and the editor of its leading journal. Chet has felt equally well treated. The two of them feel that they understand the expectations for promotion and that they will receive the support they need to attain it. Their department chair meets with each of them twice each

year for a conversation about their work to date, telling them that there should be no surprises for anyone when it is time for their review.

If pressed to describe the aspects of their academic lives that are not perfect, they would tell you that they wish they had more time to learn what is going on in other departments and schools. Both work in areas of rich potential for multi-disciplinary collaboration but feel limited in their exposure to the University beyond their department. They would also express a desire to teach one fewer course each year – the demands of teaching in a service department really do take their toll (both currently teach four courses per year). Finally, they struggle with day care. They were not able to get into the day care on the Medical Center campus, so either Chet or Dora must be on the road each day by 5:30 since the suburban day care center that they use imposes hefty fines if they pick up their children after 6:00 p.m.

But Dora and Chet are extraordinarily happy. They say that their department is like their extended family, that they are very glad they came to the University of Rochester, and that given the opportunity to choose again they would not hesitate to remain here.

Case Study #2: Barriers to Integration

Anita is an assistant professor in medical science on the researcher-teacher track. She came to the UR six years ago from a post-doc at one of the nation's finest private research universities. Since beginning her work here Anita has continued to pursue a research agenda established under the supervision of her post-doctoral mentor, collaborating with three other members of her field – just one of whom is on the University of Rochester faculty.

Anita has been told that her current research is highly valued by her department; however, she has known for some time that what she really wants is to go in a completely different direction--to pursue community-based research, focused on health care disparities. Unfortunately, she has heard from others in the school that community-based work (one person referred to it as "minority research") will not help her tenure case when it comes time for her promotion review. As she thinks about it, also unsettling is the fact that those who have told her how important her contributions are have all been acquaintances from other departments. She is not sure they have a good understanding of what is valued in her department. She is not really sure she does.

8

No one at the UR has initiated a mentoring relationship with Anita. If pressed to name her University of Rochester mentor, she would say that she guesses she is her own mentor. She did seek out the advice of a senior colleague when she was writing her first grant, and he gave her a number of helpful suggestions--to develop a relationship with the granting agency's program manager and to seek out the assistance of the department's administrator early in the application process. But he did not offer to read her proposal and give her feedback and she was uncomfortable asking him to, knowing how busy he is. When her grant application was rejected she was devastated. She began questioning her capacity to pursue research independent of her former mentor. It took the support of a friend from graduate school, who reminded her of the rate of rejection of first-time proposals, to regain perspective. But when it comes to her future as a scholar, her thoughts keep returning to community-based research. She would like very much to know how an endeavor of this nature would be viewed but doesn't know what she would do if she revealed her true interests only to be told she should drop the idea.

Anita did have two lengthy meetings with her very cordial department chair in her first four years in the department. In these conversations, she had an opportunity to express her preferences for teaching assignments, and when she described some of her research he responded with real interest, drawing parallels between her work and some he had been involved in at an earlier point in his career. She felt like he really had an appreciation for her work and grasped its implications. She did not, however, receive any detailed feedback from the chair about the progress that he thought she was making in terms of promotion. He has since retired. Her new department chair, appointed eighteen months ago, has not yet spoken to Anita beyond the friendly "Hello" in the hall, although he has said that his plan is to meet with all faculty members one-on-one before long. (She has heard that this process has begun.)

Anita's sense of the University essentially begins and ends with her department, though her area of research could easily lend itself to collaborations with faculty in other medical departments, the biological sciences, nursing and public health. She has attended few University functions in her six years on campus. She has heard of Meliora Weekend, but doesn't know much about it, and has been to the Eastman Theatre just once, when a friend of her mother's visited Rochester and wanted to attend a concert. But she has very little sense of the University outside of the medical center and can't tell you any field for which it is famous other than music. She was surprised to learn recently that Frederick

Douglass's papers are at the University, and that it has an institute bearing his name.

Anita is enormously impressed with her graduate students and post-doctoral fellows with whom she has worked. In fact, she spends a great deal of time speaking with minority students, who seem to show up at her office all hours of the day. Oddly, her overall teaching evaluations have not reflected these positive one-on-one experiences. And there have been a few instances in which she has felt a distinctly unfriendly – bordering on hostile – environment in her classroom, which left her feeling extraordinarily uncomfortable and confused. She is concerned that her promotion review will emphasize the formal evaluations, with no opportunity for her to show her many productive hours with satisfied students, since there is no formal accounting of them. She is not sure that she has anyone with whom she can comfortably discuss this issue.

All in all, Anita has very mixed feelings about her place in her department, her school, and the University as a whole. She continues to be impressed by the academic quality of her colleagues and her students. But there are times when this doesn't feel like sufficient reason to stay at Rochester. She suspects that there must be other great research universities that feel more inclusive, where the value of her contributions would be more certain and community work might be better rewarded than at the University of Rochester. She also worries that there is a chance she will not be at liberty to make such a choice about her future anyway, given the tremendous uncertainties associated with her tenure case.

Case Study #3: Alienation and Disaffection

Merritt is a full professor in arts and humanities, a member of the University of Rochester faculty for fourteen years. He was hired here as an associate professor with tenure, after launching his academic career and being tenured at a top-ranked public research university, in the preeminent program in the nation in his area of specialty. Since arriving he has produced a prodigious body of scholarly work, played the leading role in reinvigorating his department's doctoral program and introduced a total of seven new courses to the undergraduate curriculum. He came to the UR in the year following a vigorous campaign by students to increase cultural and ethnic studies in the curriculum and address the absence of faculty diversity.

It has never been remotely intimated that his appointment was a response to the students' activism, and in fact the groundwork to add a faculty line in his field was being laid prior to it, but Merritt's background equipped him to help his department quickly bring very relevant new courses and programs online and he was given wide latitude to do so. He has never felt that his promotion to full professor was based on anything other than having met the same high standards of scholarship, teaching and service expected of anyone at that rank and at the same time is aware that the role he played in helping the university be responsive to its students brought immense relief ---and was deeply appreciated---by the then administration.

In a sense Merritt's experience at the University of Rochester is an example of the best possible environment to which diversity initiatives aspire, in which people of all races and origins begin from a level playing field and are equally supported, their chances for success tied to the merits of their performance. While he had little need of formal mentoring at the point in his career when he joined the Rochester faculty, the department chair at the time went out of his way to ensure that Merritt received the necessary administrative support to begin his work and personally introduced him to a number of colleagues with similar interests and to the cultural life of the city. His success illustrates the approach to leadership described as "making sure a person gets what he needs and then staying out of his way."

Unfortunately Merritt has a hard time believing his experience is emblematic of faculty of color at the University of Rochester in general. He remains one of just two "non-whites" on a faculty of twenty-five (thirty if you count the adjuncts and part-time lecturers) and the only African American. He has no idea how many faculty of color there are at UR outside his school. Throughout his career here he has heard promises from the administration about a commitment to increasing the diversity of the faculty, staff, and student bodies but has yet to see numbers reflecting a real effort to do so. While he finds the current administration's pronouncements on this subject to be the most sincere sounding yet, when he looks at the composition of the University leadership, at both central administration and school levels, he sees the same white, male, middle-aged, elite university-educated group that has always been dominate at the top. It is hard to believe that this group, sincere intentions notwithstanding, would know how to convert these words to action.

More disturbing is what Merritt knows about the personal experience of those from underrepresented groups who have followed him onto the faculty. One

colleague confided to him that the promotion and tenure process in her department is shrouded in mystery and appears to favor males but she has been afraid to speak up about what she perceives to be a discriminatory environment because she has observed retaliatory behavior by senior faculty, which department leadership has failed to address. She plans to leave. Another, who achieved tenure and now aspires to move into leadership has been told she is "not ready" to be thinking about such a move. She cannot figure out what it was about a male colleague, who joined the faculty after her and had no prior leadership experience that made him more ready than she was for the program director appointment he just received. Another scholar of color to whom Merritt has become close operates in a mindset of paranoia, working alone, carefully guarding his research, and rarely volunteering for service out of a fear that to do so would be taken as a sign he doesn't understand academic priorities or possess the discipline to keep his focus where it needs to be.

When Merritt meets with junior faculty from underrepresented groups they frequently end up talking about the University's poor track record in the area of diversity. He has heard stories about demeaning teaching evaluations from students and in some instances, insulting student classroom behavior, but is told that there is no use reporting this to anyone because it will be ignored. He has heard great weariness at being called on time and again to be the "voice" for underrepresented groups on committees, or the "face" of diversity in University promotional materials.

Merritt is not surprised when faculty from underrepresented groups are not tenured, nor has it surprised him when they have been tenured and still chosen to leave. He believes that conditions at the University will not change without a tremendous effort, department by department, and without courage of a kind never before seen here, from the top. Unfortunately, he thinks that this won't happen without change first at the senior levels, and feels that the likelihood for creating the best possible community for his colleagues is further diminished by deep seated feelings of resentment among the non-dominant faculty groups.

Merritt is deeply pained to see unhappiness among junior colleagues who want to contribute and grow at the University. He wishes that the situation was different, that all faculty of color would have the positive experience that he has had in his career here. The need, it seems, is to move from an undirected approach, dependent on the proclivities of individual department chairs, to the studied creation of a culture of support University-wide. He doesn't know, from where he sits, how to influence the development of such an environment.

Note: None of the three case studies should be taken literally. The reader should not try to identify the people or the departments because none exist in precisely this form.

<u>Linking the Illustrations to Recommendations</u>

Moving from case illustrations to report recommendations, it is important to remember that the cases are fictionalized narratives of the critical themes of underrepresented faculty's experience, clustered at three points along a continuum, with no case depicting a particular department or any one individual's experience at the University of Rochester.

These themes, aspects of faculty experience more likely to be problematic for members of minority groups than to those in the majority, cluster as four broad issues: inconsistent support for faculty career development, uneven leadership within schools and departments, inadequate attention to personal life factors affecting the ability to succeed, and an organizational culture with elements still more exclusionary than inclusive.

The power of these themes to illuminate the challenges and opportunities in attracting and retaining a diverse and excellent faculty is reflected in the analyzed data that serve as preambles to the fourteen recommendations outlined below. The recommendations are categorized within the four areas of development, leadership, personal needs, and organizational culture. In some cases, the recommendations respond directly to one of the problems identified above. Other recommendations address a number of issues simultaneously while others are extensions and improvements to existing UR programs and policies already in place. In this we find reason for great optimism; building on what we have already begun, we have the opportunity to approach the work ahead in the true spirit of *Meliora*.

Recommendations:

Development

1. Establish University-wide resources that address the unevenness of sufficient faculty mentoring
2. Develop expectations at the departmental level for promotion and tenure that are consistent with our established University criteria
3. Prepare graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and residents to be faculty members nationally or, in some cases, to become UR faculty
4. Provide an easy resource for diversity grants

Leadership

5. Expand leadership seminars for department chairs and deans
6. Develop faculty leadership capacity

Personal Needs

7. Increase University support for faculty pre-hiring and welcoming
8. Extend the family friendly policies to graduate students
9. Attend to the needs of dual career couples
10. Address the faculty's family care needs

Organizational Culture

11. Establish an Annual All-University Conference on Diversity and Inclusion
12. Increase integration and support of programs that build a more inclusive environment
13. Provide University support for a visiting faculty/post-doctoral fellow program
14. Institutionalize active listening

The following table shows the relationship, in percentages and raw numbers, of faculty comments to the four categories, and the recommendations that follow from them.

Listening Tour 2008-09
Linking Participant Comments to Recommendation Categories
% of Listening Tour participants making comments leading to recommendation in this category

	Development	Leadership	Personal Needs	Organizational Culture
% of **all** listening tour participants	64% (60 out of 94)	56% (53 out of 94)	36% (34 out of 94)	51% (48 out of 94)
% of listening tour participants from **underrepresented groups**	69% (49 out of 71)	55% (39 out of 71)	34% (24 out of 71)	58% (41 out of 71)
% of listening tour participants from the **random sample**	48% (11 out of 23)	61% (14 out of 23)	43% (10 out of 23)	30% (7 out of 23)
% of **female** listening tour participants	69% (41 out of 59)	58% (34 out of 59)	41% (24 out of 59)	53% (31 out of 59)
% of **male** listening tour participants	54% (19 out of 35)	54% (19 out of 35)	29% (10 out of 35)	49% (17 out of 35)

It is important to note that our faculty do face the wide range of experiences illustrated by the cases. That is, the comments in the four categories reflect both positive and negative experiences in those categories. Consequently, many of the recommendations address not a complete absence of an inclusive or supportive practice, but rather a **gap** in that experience. We are confident that we can provide professional support to all faculty, that we can meet their personal needs, and that we can foster a University climate that makes them want to stay at Rochester. We are confident because we know that for many, this climate already exists. We have many academic leaders for whom creating a culture of inclusion and support is as much a part of their day as teaching and research. While we have drawn on models in other universities to help develop University-wide programs and policies, we need not look outside the University of Rochester for examples of what can be done at the individual level. We are fortunate that these recommendations allow us to build on models within our own community.

It should also be noted that while this study focuses on the experiences of faculty who are in demographic categories labeled "underrepresented," the recommendations that follow will benefit a whole range of faculty, including those in the majority. Inclusion is about <u>everyone</u> in the community.

Development

Recommendation 1: Establish University-wide resources that address the unevenness of sufficient faculty mentoring

Of the 94 faculty with whom we met, 55 raised issues associated with mentoring, and the relationship between faculty success and mentoring support, or conversely, faculty struggles in the absence of mentoring. Further, we know from the literature that if mentoring is left to chance, women will be less likely to experience a mentoring relationship than men and faculty of color will be less likely to have a mentor than white faculty (see, for example, Judy Jackson, "The story is not in the numbers,: *NWSA Journal*, 16:1, p.172). Our data reflects this as well. Of the 55 listening tour faculty who brought up mentoring, 46 are in our "underrepresented" groups, nearly 2/3 of those in the category. There is an extensive academic literature demonstrating that people who are mentored are more productive and more successful than those who are not.

Finally, the 2006 Task Force report recommended "that each school consider recognizing faculty leadership and mentoring by including them among the factors considered in promotion and reappointment criteria. Schools should adopt policies including mentorship of junior faculty among the options for faculty promotion to encourage senior faculty to devote the time necessary to mentor."

Recommended Action: We recommend that the University take steps to ensure that faculty from academic departments where mentoring is not the norm be offered access to mentoring resources available outside of their departments. These may include, for example, an office that assists faculty in locating a mentor elsewhere within (or in some cases, outside of) the University. We also recommend that the University provide appropriate programming (e.g., workshops) to support faculty mentors and mentees campus-wide. Finally, we endorse the 2006 Task Force recommendation regarding mentoring as a factor for promotion.

Tasks initiated: In response to the considerable concern expressed about mentoring in the listening tour, the Office for Faculty Development and Diversity hosted a one-day conference on the topic in May 2009. Approximately 90 faculty members from across campuses attended one of two half-day sessions, each featuring a presentation by Mary Sorcinelli, Associate Provost for Faculty Development at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, describing their "UMass Mutual Mentoring" initiative. Several UR faculty also related their personal mentoring experiences. We read the high attendance at these sessions to

be an indication of hunger for mentoring on our campus. This program started a conversation about the importance of faculty mentoring that led to the formation of a working group, which met throughout summer and fall 2009 to design and propose a UR mentoring program. Thirty faculty from around the University are collaborating to produce a proposal for University-wide mentoring programs, expected in November 2009.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Senior Associate Provost and Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity.

Recommendation 2: Develop expectations at the departmental level for promotion and tenure that are consistent with our established University criteria

We spoke with six faculty, five of whom are from underrepresented groups, who have concluded that community based work, even when closely tied to their research, would be undervalued in promotion decisions. This issue was especially pronounced in the School of Medicine and Dentistry, where four of 23 people interviewed made reference to the issue. This is particularly disconcerting to those for whom work in the community not only is research driven, but also benefits the University by reinforcing ties to the people we depend on to staff our hospitals, participate in our clinical trials, fill our concert halls, and apply to our educational programs. Some faculty cited this perception that their community work is of low value, as the most disappointing aspect of their University of Rochester experience.

It should be noted here that the University – at the level of the Provost, University Ad Hoc Committee members, and deans – does value service in its consideration of tenure cases; further, it should be noted that community service is referenced in the School of Medicine and Dentistry's *Regulations of the Faculty* as a criteria for promotion in some activity options. However, considerations of community based research and service do not appear to be uniformly applied at the department level, the point at which promotion cases are first considered.

Recommended Action: We recommend that each school within the University ensures that expectations for promotion and tenure, as applied within each academic unit, are consistent with the University's established criteria. Schools should consider an appropriate method for ensuring that community service and community-based research is appropriately incorporated into the evaluation for promotion and tenure at the department level. The Office for Faculty Development and Diversity will collect information on this work at each school and develop a list of best practices for university-wide distribution.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: The Provost working through the Deans' Committee on Administrative Practices. The deans would then work with department chairs to translate University guidelines for evaluation of community service and community-based research into departmental expectations and actual practice.

Recommendation 3: Prepare graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and residents to be faculty members nationally or, in some cases, UR faculty

Striking for the number of times it came up in conversations focused on faculty, the observation that "the group for whom we do the least as an institution includes some of the brightest people in our community-- our post-doc and department fellows" pointed up opportunities we may be missing to attract some of these "best and brightest" to our faculty. Related to this, many faculty expressed general frustration with the means through which they came to fully understand their faculty roles, and with the imbalance between training received for conducting research and training received for the rest of faculty careers, including teaching, service, and citizenship.

While the disciplinary preparation of graduate students, post-docs, and residents is naturally department-specific, marshalling University resources to prepare developing scholars more broadly for academic careers and including them in our community life would increase our chances of attracting them to our faculty when we seek to do so. Establishing University-based programs that embrace these most transient and isolated community members also strengthens our external reputation as an inclusive and welcoming place to do graduate and post-doctoral work, a significant issue to the underrepresented groups whose movement into the pipeline we want to foster. Of the 12 faculty who spoke to the importance of preparing the "pre-faculty" population for their future roles, 11 were from underrepresented groups.

Recommended Action: We recommend that the Faculty Diversity Officers committee study the feasibility of establishing a professional development program for graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and residents. The program might be based on input from faculty and students from representative disciplines.

Selected peer examples: The Columbia University Office of Post-Doctoral Affairs hosts development training sessions which are open to all post-docs within the university.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: University Office of Graduate Studies, the Office of Graduate Medical Education in the School of Medicine and Dentistry, and the Office for Faculty Development and Diversity.

Recommendation 4: Provide an easy resource for diversity grants

Increasingly, federal and private grantors offer diversity-promoting initiatives, but it can be difficult for faculty, staff, and grants administrators to stay abreast of the ever-changing pool of opportunities available. We heard a significant range of awareness across faculty regarding the existence of such grants. While grants associated with diversity promotion exist across all fields, they are most prevalent in fields funded by the NIH. As an example, the NIH "Research Supplements to Promote Diversity in Health Related Research" is a supplement-based funding initiative that can be attached to the majority of existing NIH research grants. This funding mechanism pays indirect costs at the full negotiated rate, and historically have been funded at a rate that exceeds 50 percent. At the UR, just six to eight of these supplements were appended to existing NIH grants between 2005 and 2008. This represents a fraction of the total number of eligible NIH awards that could have supported one of these supplements over that period.

In certain fields, there is also grant funding available to support disparities research, which, while not necessarily limited to faculty from underrepresented groups, is more commonly associated with underrepresented faculty than with majority faculty. University support for identifying such grants would benefit all faculty for whom such research is of interest.

Recommended Action: We recommend that the University provide a centralized, accessible listing of potential funding sources to promote diversity and career development across all disciplines, from federal, state, and private sources, as well as funding for disparities research (and other topics of particular interest to underrepresented faculty). We anticipate that this initiative will pay for itself by year two, and will bring additional net dollars to the University by year three.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Office for Faculty Development and Diversity, in coordination with the Office of Research and Project Administration, the Office of Corporate and Foundation Relations, and the David T. Kearns Center for Leadership and Diversity.

Leadership

Recommendation 5: Expand leadership seminars for department chairs and deans

The listening tour was instrumental in shining light on the ways cultural norms and organizational practices give rise to the working environments in our academic units and schools, and the impact they have on inclusion. Many traditional, widely accepted, indeed "protected" norms of individual, group, and departmental practice, while serving the University's vision of excellence and *Meliora*, can inadvertently exclude individuals who belong to groups underrepresented in their fields.

A substantial number of current University faculty in underrepresented groups report conditions that produce feelings of isolation and discouragement. This is not uniformly true. A smaller number of this group report a different environment, one that is inviting and supportive of them and their work. The difference in the experience of these two groups appears to reside in the leadership behavior of their immediate supervisor, i.e., department chair, center director, division chief. Consciously or not these leaders set the tone, signaling the cultural climate and providing the example of what constitutes inclusion.

The tour confirmed the powerful role that each department (or school) plays in defining the academic identity and future of early career faculty and strongly suggests that if we wish to create the changes necessary to promote diversity and inclusion university-wide, we must focus on department-level leadership. Comments and suggestions from over half of the 94 listening tour participants urge development of a recommendation acknowledging the impact of department-level climate on the University's effort to recruit and retain a diverse faculty.

The University currently offers a leadership workshop series to newly named academic leaders in the first year of their appointments. The new leaders determine the workshop topics, generating a list of issues that concern them and then narrowing them to the set they most want to discuss, to form the series. Two-hour sessions combine case study discussion with commentary by campus experts on the day's subject. While topics such as budgeting and strategic thinking are always proposed, each year the top "vote-getters" relate to the human issues of academic leadership: support for pre-tenure faculty, giving feedback and delivering bad news, building community, managing staff, keeping senior faculty engaged.

Recommended Action: We recommend acting upon what we now know to be mutually felt interests of new leaders and underrepresented faculty regarding the human environment in their departments and schools, and expanding our existing leadership program to all department chairs and deans as well as new leaders.

Specifically, we recommend convening a planning group of five to seven current department chairs to meet for a short series of meetings, to take place between January and March 2010, and then introduce the new leadership program in a single pilot session, to be held in early April, testing focus, format, content, etc. with a "live" group of chairs. We propose a planning group drawn from the list of over 50 academic leaders who have actively participated in our leadership programs in the last three years, and from the group of chairs we know to be very effective leaders based on our listening tour findings. While the planning group would be limited to seven, the larger group can serve in an advisory capacity, with their reactions to the developing plans collected as feedback for the planning process. They can also comprise part of the audience for the pilot.

This process should merge the historical focus on the human issues of academic leadership with the issues of diversity and inclusiveness. In addition to setting the focus, format and content for a University of Rochester Leadership series, we recommend that the planning group also consider drawing on external resources who can bring "best practice" experiences from their institutions to discussions of leadership in ours; and finally, explore participation in national leadership development programs, such as those offered by the American Council on Education, the Center for Creative Leadership, the Academy for Academic Leadership.

Lastly, we recommend development of a system of incentives for pursuing additional professional leadership (outside of the programs that the University offers) and rewards for academic leaders who demonstrate excellence in creating a supportive and inclusive academic environment.

Selected Peer Examples: The University of North Carolina's College of Arts and Sciences provides a forum and peer network for new and reappointed chairs that creates a mentor system in which first-time chairs can benefit from insights and advice from experienced chairs. The University of Washington offers quarterly, half-day workshops for department chairs in engineering and science, focused on topics including: dual career hires; faculty development opportunities; delivering bad news; building consensus among faculty. MIT offers workshops

open to science and engineering faculty throughout the country in human centered strategies for leading engineering teams in academic environments, including assessment of each participant's personal leadership style.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Senior Associate Provost.

Recommendation 6: Develop faculty leadership capacity

Some faculty expressed concern that the lack of diversity among University leadership is obvious to the diverse faculty whom we are trying to recruit, and makes attracting them even more difficult. Others expressed the belief that lack of diversity at senior levels means that their own interest in academic leadership positions at the University is not welcome.

Recommended Action: We recommend that the University show visible support for the advancement of women and faculty of color to academic leadership positions. Our recommendation has two components. First we propose internal University leadership seminars for interested faculty, designed to better prepare them to compete for vice provost, associate dean and department chair roles. Sessions could include such topics as strategic planning, budgeting, fundraising and crisis management. Second, we recommend participation in national leadership programs, such as the ACE Fellows Program, Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine [ELAM] program, Higher Education Resource Services [HERS] Institutes, etc. We recommend that the University supplement the cost of sending promising faculty to such programs. While all faculty would be eligible for both the internal and external programs, individuals from groups underrepresented in University of Rochester leadership would be especially encouraged to participate.

For internal seminars, and especially for the time-intensive national leadership programs, we imagine encouraging recently tenured faculty (or faculty who don't intend to pursue a tenured position) for participation, so as not to distract pre-tenure faculty from the work they need to do to achieve tenure. That said, the University should not systematically exclude pre-tenure faculty (or those not on the tenure track) who are eager to participate, except in the case of external programs that include such requirements for participation.

The fund that supports participation in national leadership programs could operate much like the Special Opportunities Fund, with nomination by the deans, applicant screening by the Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity,

and final approval by the Provost (with appropriate cost-sharing between the Provost's fund and the deans).

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Senior Associate Provost, the Office for Faculty Development and Diversity, and the Faculty Diversity Officers Committee.

Personal Needs

Recommendation 7: Increase University support for faculty pre-hiring and welcoming

The faculty hiring experience varies widely across the University. Because we spoke with some faculty who have been here for many years, however, we heard more variation than we believe currently exists (primarily due to efforts begun in 2007 to welcome faculty including the social and informational events of the UR Year One program and a personalized welcome letter from the President and Provost). Nevertheless, there are many issues that new faculty face that cannot be appropriately addressed in group settings – some of which could or should be addressed prior to faculty arrival. These may include the needs of a spouse or partner who requires a job in the area, or the desire of an incoming family to locate an ethnic, religious, or other particular community in the Rochester area. In both of these cases it may be difficult for a department chair to assist. Also, incoming faculty members may not be comfortable bringing up these issues. Someone at the University level should proactively intercede to offer help.

Recommended Action: We recommend that all faculty recruits be offered a one-on-one meeting with the Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity or other appropriate person in the Office of the Provost. This can happen at the finalist stage, after an offer has been made, or after an offer has been accepted. We further recommend that a reference be made to the Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity in the welcome letter that the President and Provost send to all new faculty.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Office for Faculty Development and Diversity to coordinate.

Recommendation 8: Extend the family friendly policies to graduate students

Some faculty expressed concern that graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and residents who are new parents are frequently penalized because department chairs lack clear guidance on how to accommodate their family needs, and consequently may do nothing. While it is clear that in some departments, appropriate accommodations are common, the University's failure to institute clear system-wide policies to address the family needs of this population affects the climate within some departments, for not just the graduate students, post-docs, and residents, but for their faculty colleagues. Further, without a campus policy the differential treatment across departments is observable to people, adding to a perception that the University is indifferent, at best, to family issues.

Recommended Action: We recommend that the family friendly guidelines regarding leave for new parents be extended to graduate students. Further, we recommend that a working group study how these guidelines can be extended to post-doctoral fellows and residents, in what cases they might have to be department- or program-specific, and whether alternatives to existing family friendly guidelines might be better for post-doctoral fellows and medical residents.

Currently, for example, the *Faculty Handbook* states that "New parent faculty members may be eligible for a modification of their regularly assigned duties . . . during the 'semester of birth' [of the child of any faculty member, male or female] with no adjustment of salary and benefits." To apply this to graduate students, the University guideline might read, "New parent graduate students may be eligible to forego teaching assistance obligations or attendance at graduate seminars during the semester of birth of a child to that graduate student, male or female." An analogous case exists in the one-year extension of the tenure clock for all new faculty parents. For graduate students, this extension would apply to the time limit to degree, without requiring a specific extension request (with extensions to time limits granted without guarantee of additional funding). No extension of family friendly guidelines to graduate students could contradict policies or rules that exist for those who are funded by external grants.

Selected peer examples: At Harvard University, post-doctoral fellow birth mothers may take 13 weeks paid maternity leave (paid by 8 weeks short term disability, 4 weeks parental leave and 1 week vacation time if any). "Primary care" parents receive 4 weeks paid leave whether fathers or mothers, adoptive or birth parents; fathers who are not primary care parents receive 1 week parental leave.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: The Provost will work with the deans and legal counsel to draft policy guidelines.

Recommendation 9: Attend to the needs of dual career couples

Over one in five faculty with whom we spoke made the point that the University needs to do a better job addressing the issues associated with dual career couples. Fifteen of the twenty faculty who mentioned this issue were women, suggesting that women are more affected by the issue than men. The suspicion is that when a woman is recruited and there is no obvious position for her male partner, the recruitment often fails; but when a man is recruited without the promise of a position for his female partner, the recruitment may still succeed. If this is true at the University of Rochester, it is consistent with the literature on this topic. (See, for example, Junge Akademie, "Academic dual-career couples in the U.S.: Review of the North American social research," January 2002.)

Recommended Action: We recommend that the University replace the current ad hoc system of responding to assistance with dual career hires as they arise, with a regularly updated , centralized list of all available faculty and fellowship positions. Further, we recommend that the Faculty Diversity Officers Committee study the examples of dual career practices of leading peers, such as Cornell, Vanderbilt, and the Universities of Michigan, Iowa, and Toronto. The Committee should determine the resource implications of adopting/adapting the existing best practice models. Any solution would amplify the case-by-case, networking assistance the UR provides at this point.

Selected peer examples: Cornell, Michigan, Toronto, and Iowa have established offices of career services for spouses/partners of new faculty, housed either in the Office of the Provost (Michigan) or Human Resources (Cornell, Toronto, Iowa) and aimed at supporting faculty recruitment by providing partners/spouses placement services, including: career coaching, assistance with resume and cover letter preparation, salary negotiation, interviewing, and networking skill development. Michigan has conducted extensive evaluation of its programs, including effects on retention rates of both new faculty and their spouses/partners, and satisfaction levels of the academic departments using their services. Vanderbilt University's Office of Family Recruitment and Relocation Resources offers services including assistance to spouses seeking employment by providing them information on area job openings, networking, and search firms and personnel agencies.

Tasks already completed: The University joined the Western New York Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC), a regional network organized to support member institutions' recruitment efforts through web-based sharing of jobs information, in 2007. This resource has limited value, however, due to the small number of relevant faculty positions posted by our neighboring partner institutions. We do provide one-to-one assistance to the spouses or partners of potential and newly recruited faculty, identifying opportunities within and outside the University and assisting in securing funding for internal positions as needed. The effectiveness of this program however, is subject to the limits on staff availability to perform work associated with an employment office.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Office for Faculty Development and Diversity to coordinate the exploratory committee.

Recommendation 10: Address the faculty's family care needs

In comments similar to those regarding dual career couples, many faculty mentioned childcare as a significant aspect of quality of life. Also similarly, this was expressed as an issue for women. Of the nine faculty who raised the issue, all were female, representing 16 percent of the women with whom we spoke. While women faculty were quick to note that their spouses were partners in childcare, our anecdotal evidence supports the data from family research, that women shoulder the lion's share of the childcare and other home life responsibilities. They are more likely to miss a late afternoon meeting to retrieve a child from daycare, forego a recruitment dinner in order to be home, or be the one to work out a solution when a family member's illness disrupts daily routines.

Recommended Action: In the long term, we recommend that the University work with a childcare provider to find a suitable location near the River and Medical Center campuses to accommodate additional faculty and staff children. In the immediate term, we recommend that the University communicate with the University's faculty and staff about its plans, keeping them up-to-date on progress in securing a new facility, and more regularly advertise the Family Care Program, which makes referrals to other daycare centers and childcare providers. We also want to reiterate recommendation 8 from the 2006 Task Force Report, which called for an examination of needs associated with elder care among our faculty and staff.

Selected peer examples: Cornell University has provided significant support to its faculty and staff's child care needs through childcare grants---subsidies to help Cornell employees with child care expenses. The grants cover

childcare for work days, school holidays, summer vacations and teacher work days. Columbia University has increased childcare options by teaming up with providers in the neighborhood to assist faculty and staff with their needs.

Tasks already completed: In 2007, the University of Rochester contracted with the Knowledge Learning Corporation to assess the childcare needs of UR faculty and staff. Survey results revealed an unmet need for additional or expanded childcare facilities on or in close proximity to campus. Acting on these results, the University's Office of Human Resources evaluated three sites near the Medical and River Campuses. None were suitable, nor could they be retrofitted at a reasonable cost. Currently, Human Resources staff are reaching out to other operators of childcare facilities, hoping to identify a company willing to invest capital in developing a facility that will meet the demand.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Office of Human Resources and Office for Faculty Development and Diversity.

Organizational Culture

Recommendation 11: Establish an Annual All-University Conference on Diversity and Inclusion

Programs and policies aimed at achieving greater diversity and a more inclusive working environment for our students, staff, and faculty may originate in any division of the University, including any of the six schools, the hospitals, and the administrative offices. In our decentralized system, these localized programs can be aligned to the priorities of the division, and yield their greatest benefits to those within. There are occasions, however, when more broadly coordinated efforts would benefit the University as a whole. Eleven faculty on the listening tour expressed concern that the University appears to be placing singular focus on faculty to the near exclusion of other members of our community, while recognizing that at the school level this may not be the case. The listening tour made clear that many faculty are keenly aware of staff and student diversity, and that University programs and policies that address (or do not) these groups' needs have a powerful influence on the institutional climate for all.

Recommended Action: In order to achieve the benefits associated with coordination, we recommend instituting an annual University Diversity Conference, to bring together those involved in existing diversity and inclusion

programs campus wide. The conference goal would be to improve communication, forge better coordination and foster expansion of diversity policies and programs for all our constituencies: faculty, students, staff, alumni, donors, patients, and citizens of the greater Rochester area.

We recommend a planning team composed of a representative from the Faculty Diversity Officers' Group; senior administrators from the Office of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, the Office of Advancement, and the Office of Administration and Finance; and a senior administrator responsible for student recruitment/retention from each of the six schools. The Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity should convene the planning group and provide staff support. The team should have the authority to request reports, presentations, and data from anyone responsible for programs associated with UR diversity initiatives for use in developing the conference agenda. Following the conference, its proceedings, accomplishments and suggestions for new directions, should be presented to the President's Cabinet jointly by planning team members and staff of the Office for Faculty Development and Diversity

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Office for Faculty Development and Diversity.

Recommendation 12: Increase integration and support of programs that build a more inclusive environment

Our faculty retention success depends, in part, on our ability to make our faculty feel part of a community. For those who belong to a majority group such attachments form quite easily. For those who are members of an underrepresented group in their department, feelings of isolation are more likely.[2]

During the listening tour we heard from a number of faculty that they believed themselves to be the only (or one of very few) faculty members from a particular ethnic group within the University. This perception was not always consistent with reality.

Several faculty members indicated that they would welcome a plan for bringing people together, both through social organizations reflecting cultural

---

[2] For some, this might be the underrepresented gender, for others it might be an underrepresented race, and for yet others it might be something else (native language, socioeconomic background, sexual preference, even academic field).

identity and events designed to bring people together across cultural boundaries. Thirty-four faculty raised issues or made suggestions leading to this recommendation.

Recommended Action: We recommend increasing University support for social organizations that appeal to faculty and staff from underrepresented groups. Further we recommend the members themselves develop and control the programming and communication, while the University provides the administrative and financial support. We also recommend increased programming in collaboration with University entities whose natural constituencies are underrepresented peoples, e.g., the Frederick Douglass Institute, the Susan B. Anthony Institute, the Anthony Center for Women's Leadership, the International Services Office, and the Office of Minority Student Affairs. This programming could be academic, professional, social, and community-based. It would counter the isolation of members of underrepresented groups and create opportunities to introduce the richly diverse cultures of our own region to the University community. For example, we were struck, in thinking about Western New York's Native American population, how little our campus community knows about the Seneca Nation and how virtually invisible it is on this campus given its history and presence in the region.

Tasks completed: We have created email listservs to allow for targeted communication to faculty from underrepresented groups, and started the process of identifying faculty members to "own" each list. The Office for Faculty Development and Diversity would be responsible for keeping the lists up-to-date. Additionally, discussions are underway to make Black History Month a truly university-wide celebration, rather than isolated, unit-specific events.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Office for Faculty Development and Diversity to coordinate.

Recommendation 13: Provide University support for a visiting faculty/post-doctoral fellow program

Many faculty we met on the listening tour expressed frustration with the speed at which demographic changes in any faculty can take place, even under ideal economic conditions. They were eager to find ways to increase diversity quickly, independent of making great numbers of new faculty hires. Among the most promising suggestions we heard for immediate change was creation of a visiting faculty or faculty exchange program.

Recommended Action: We recommend that the University develop and support a visiting faculty program or a faculty exchange program to increase the number of underrepresented faculty on our campus. These could include short-term visits as well as full semester or year-long visits.

Although this program will be open to faculty and post-doctoral fellows from any university, we further recommend seeking partnerships with two or three historically black colleges (HBCUs), Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs), and tribal colleges. Before beginning the work to establish relationships with HBCUs, HSIs, and tribal colleges, we must bring together information about all other recent and current University of Rochester associations with those institutions. We recommend adapting the annual school-based diversity assessment process to collect that information.

We also recommend the University consider hosting researchers from developing countries (perhaps through the recently developed partnership between the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Agency for International Development).

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Office for Faculty Development and Diversity.

Recommendation 14: Institutionalize active listening

The 2008-09 listening tour was enormously helpful in bringing to light the difficult issues our faculty face each day. The faculty themselves also benefited by having an opportunity to voice their concerns and anticipate that they will be acted upon. Finally, the listening tour revealed the existence of best practices around the University providing models on which we can draw.

Recommended Action: We recommend that this sort of face-to-face **listening** become an institutionalized process. The Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity (or her or his designee) may use individual meetings, focus groups, town hall meetings, or some combination of these, to accomplish this. While convinced of the extraordinary value of the one-on-one meetings of the 2008-2009 listening tour, we recognize that the University may not have the resources to continuously repeat this range of individual meetings. With that in mind, we recommend offering at least one individual meeting with new faculty who belong to an underrepresented demographic group, and some small random

sample of new faculty from majority groups each year. And we recommend a review, similar to that which produced this report, every four years.

Selected peer examples: Cornell University listens to members of their University community through its Feedback Program, which invites faculty, staff, and students to share personal experiences that have made them feel either welcome or unwelcome at Cornell. Selected submissions are published anonymously as quarter-page ads in the *Cornell Daily Sun*. The program's goal is to stimulate ongoing conversation about diversity and improve the campus climate.

Office responsible for implementation or coordination: Office for Faculty Development and Diversity to coordinate.

Inclusive process for the development and finalization of the 14 recommendations

Appreciating the "long view" required to effect fundamental and sustainable cultural change in an institution as complex as ours, we believe we must enroll all members of the University of Rochester community, and leverage their personal and institutional power in joint pursuit of our diversity and inclusion goals. To that end, we have taken several steps:

1. Asked President Seligman, Provost Kuncl, and the senior executive deans of each school for comment, approval, and resources for the implementation of the recommendations.
2. Asked listening tour participants, the University's Faculty Diversity Officers Committee, and the President's Cabinet to comment on the report's findings and recommendations.
3. Used the input from the above individuals to refine, clarify and add to the report content and recommendations.
4. Identified recommendations for which implementation processes should be defined by faculty task forces or working groups.

All readers of this report are invited to participate in the University's diversity and inclusion initiative by sending your comments, ideas and suggestions to the Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity. In addition, please let us know of any diversity/inclusion initiatives in which you are currently, or wish to become, engaged.

Other recommendations already implemented

At various points in this report, we make reference to tasks already in process or completed. Over the course of the 2008-2009 academic year, as we engaged in the 94 faculty conversations, the town hall meetings, and the meeting of the 2006 Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness, we heard many ideas that we could implement without waiting for the formal recommendation process to run its course. These suggestions required neither significant changes in University policy or practice, nor significant new funds. The suggestions listed below have been either fully or partially implemented.

- Use coordinated graduate student recruitment events (targeting candidates from underrepresented groups) to take advantage of the critical mass created by bringing recruits together across the University in a way not possible when departments act alone: *completed in Arts, Sciences and Engineering[3]*

- Create a one-page information sheet or web page that houses all University resources for new faculty: *completed*

- Communicate the status of the thirty-one 2006 Task Force recommendations: *completed*

- Make diversity data from other universities more accessible to the UR community (including peer comparison data): *completed*

- Create visible profiles of the University's new faculty: *new process "Faculty Spotlight" added to Faculty Development News*

- Increase recruitment efforts with the National Medical Association (an organization that addresses the needs of people of African descent in medicine): *in process*

- Conduct University-wide program on race and ethnicity in recruitment and retention: *completed*

---

[3] Arts, Sciences and Engineering has invited Ph.D. programs across the University to participate (and several programs in the School of Medicine and Dentistry are doing so); however, the Office for Faculty Development and Diversity could partner with Arts, Sciences and Engineering to make this a truly University-wide initiative.

- Work with local real estate agencies to build greater understanding of the diverse needs of our faculty as they enter the Rochester community: *in process*

- Publicly recognize the accomplishments of individuals and departments or teams that contribute to diversity and inclusion: *new diversity awards announced in fall 2009*

Conclusion

If implementation of the 2006 Task Force Report 31 recommendations is considered to be Phase I of the University of Rochester Faculty Diversity Initiative, it would be appropriate to think of the fourteen recommendations described here as constituting Phase II. These recommendations go beyond the operational issues raised three years ago, although it must be noted that some of those concerns remain and are particularly evident in the recommendations related to personal needs (welcoming, family friendliness and the needs of dual career couples).

Phase II of the Faculty Diversity Initiative should place primary focus on issues of professional support and the development of inclusive attitudes and practices that will create an organizational climate comfortable for all. And as Phase II progresses we believe we must continue to monitor the University's progress on the 31 recommendations from 2006.

In recognition of the limits on the University's resources, we recommend the following implementation strategy:

Immediate Term (6 to 18 months):
Recommendation 1: Establish University-wide resources that address the unevenness of sufficient faculty mentoring (to be implemented in the immediate term assuming agreement on the forthcoming report on faculty mentoring)
Recommendation 2: Develop expectations at the departmental level for promotion and tenure that are consistent with our established University criteria
Recommendation 4: Provide an easy resource for diversity grants
Recommendation 5: Expand leadership seminars for department chairs and deans
Recommendation 7: Increase University support for faculty pre-hiring and welcoming

Recommendation 11: Establish an Annual All-University Conference on Diversity and Inclusion
Recommendation 12: Increase integration and support of programs that build a more inclusive environment
Recommendation 13: Provide University support for a visiting faculty/post-doctoral fellow program
Recommendation 14: Institutionalize active listening

Long Term (18 - 36 months):
Recommendation 3: Prepare graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and residents to be faculty members nationally or, in some cases, to become UR faculty
Recommendation 6: Develop faculty leadership capacity
Recommendation 8: Extend the family friendly policies to graduate students
Recommendation 9: Attend to the needs of dual career couples
Recommendation 10: Address the faculty's family care needs

Under this proposed strategy, the University could begin the implementation process by concentrating its efforts on nine of the 14 recommendations. These nine recommendations cross the four broad thematic areas of professional development, leadership, personal needs and organizational culture.

In choosing this implementation strategy, the University can make immediate progress in all four areas of academic life significant to the faculty we are eager to recruit and retain. It is significant to note that we advise implementing all four of the recommendations in the area of "Organizational Culture" in the immediate term, as we consider significant progress in this area critical to our overall success.

Phase II of the Faculty Diversity Initiative is not a reinvention, but rather a continuation of the extraordinary efforts over the last three years of the University's academic leadership, faculty diversity officers, search committee members, and faculty colleagues throughout the University.

Acknowledgements

2006 Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness
Status of the Implementation of the 31 Recommendations

	Recommendations	Status
1	Appoint Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity who will chair a committee of school-based faculty development officers.	The Office for Faculty Development and Diversity is now in one consolidated space. The Office communicates regularly with the University community; maintains a website; and participates in activities, meetings, workshops, and events university-wide.
2	Establish ourselves as the default starting point for faculty seeking help on issues of multiculturalism and its advancement.	
3	All schools should evaluate their faculty orientation programs and ensure that issues related to diversity are incorporated into orientation for all faculty (i.e. working with a diverse student body, colleagues, staff).	School-based programs still vary; but the Provost's UR Year One program incorporates diversity issues into its programming. http://www.rochester.edu/diversity/faculty/facultydevelopmentprograms/
4	Work with HR to create a highly visible and regular time when discussions of diversity and inclusion can take place.	Affinity group events, town hall meetings, presentations to various faculty, staff, and student groups on campus.
5	Establish consistent and comprehensive education and training standards to ensure that all searches for new faculty are inclusive.	Resources on recruitment sent to deans and department chairs and provided on our web site; subscriptions to databases; workshops. http://www.rochester.edu/diversity/faculty/facultysearch/
6	Establish a central clearing house along with a website, to address questions such as issues and concerns about local schools, assistance with daycare or eldercare, moving and real estate, resources for special needs children, adoption questions, and community organizations.	Materials continuously collected and updated on our website and in the faculty recruitment packets.
7	Dual Career: Become a central point of contact for all deans, department chairs, and faculty who need assistance with faculty spouse or partner hiring.	Deans and Search committee chairs have contacted our office to help or consult on dual career issues during many searches. We also joined the HERC (Higher Education Recruitment Consortium.) http://www.rochester.edu/diversity/faculty/dualcareer
8	Conduct a periodic survey of faculty to determine the suitability of child/elder care offerings.	HR conducted a survey in August 2007. Follow-up is ongoing.

9	Create an annual reporting system.	President's diversity report released each spring; initiated new school-based assessment report. http://www.rochester.edu/diversity/annualreports.htm
10	Create a faculty snapshot (by school/rank/gender/race).	Snapshots are collected on 9/30 every year and are publicly reported.
11	Adopt a University-wide definition of faculty applicant.	An online applicant data system implemented throughout the University.
12	Implement training for the administrators in each department who process new-hire intake paperwork to help them properly complete the faculty hire Affirmative Action forms and to highlight the importance of this process.	The online applicant data should eventually replace the need for the AA forms.
13	Create and enforce a mechanism by which faculty appointments are not placed on the "Personnel Actions" list of the Board of Trustees until the race and gender information of all applicants who were willing to provide that information is submitted to the Office of the Provost.	This recommendation replaced by the new on-line applicant data collection process.
14	Establish a definition of faculty promotion that will cover all types of faculty promotions across the University, and require that this definition be used by all staff who complete University promotion forms.	Establishing consistency in definition of "promotion" through new annual assessment tool.
15	Schools should conduct systematic exit interviews for all departing faculty.	New exit survey instrument is currently in its first trial.
16	Implement school by school climate study.	Nursing has done a climate study each year for the last three years (includes faculty, staff, students); undergrad climate survey completed in 2009 for AS&E and Eastman; AS&E now preparing for a faculty climate survey; SMD has done a less formal faculty climate survey.

17 – 20	Provost's Fund should be renamed the Special Opportunities Fund, and it should be enlarged, with the aim of enhancing the quality of the University faculty.	From FY08 through FY09 this fund was used to support 17 faculty members, and a handful of initiatives designed to attract a more diverse faculty.
21 – 26	Family Friendly Policies -- write and implement changes to Faculty Handbook.	The policies in the Faculty Handbook went into effect March 2007. In the 2007-2008 academic year, seven faculty (university wide) were known to have taken advantage of the new policies.
27	Best Practices: continue to examine methods of recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty, and for the creation of a welcoming and inclusive environment.	Continuous process.
28	Coordinate with academic leaders on policies and programs that are beneficial to all faculty who wish to come to or remain at the University of Rochester.	Continuous process.
29	Faculty Development: Most work remains at the School level, the University faculty diversity officer, however, should provide information and support to the faculty development officers in the schools that will assist the schools and departments in the retention of a diverse faculty.	Continuous process. Currently planning University-wide initiative on faculty mentoring.
30	Each school should consider recognizing faculty leadership and mentoring by including them among the factors considered in promotion and reappointment criteria.	Mentoring already an explicit factor in SMD's Researcher-Teacher, Researcher-Clinician-Teacher, and Teacher-Clinician-Scholar tracks. A University-wide task force and other academic units within the University are currently addressing the issue.
31	All schools should evaluate the support given to faculty to improve teaching techniques.	UR Year One and Early Career Faculty programs include the "Conversation on Classroom Excellence" series.

Sample Invitation to Participate in Listening Tour

Dear Professor _____:

      I am working with Carol Shuherk, Associate Provost, and Frederick Jefferson, Professor Emeritus and consultant to the University's Faculty Diversity Initiative, on improving the University's efforts to create a more diverse and welcoming community at the University of Rochester.

      We would like to meet with you to hear your ideas for the recruitment and retention of faculty. (For those of you who are relatively new to the University, the discussion may focus on topics such as your experience during your job search and recruitment, how you were introduced and welcomed to the University and the Rochester community, and the quantity and quality of support for your career development since your arrival.) We expect to use these conversations as one basis from which to develop University-wide programs that will complement activities that individual schools are implementing. President Seligman, Provost Kuncl, Dean _____, and other University leaders support this initiative; however, our conversations will remain completely confidential and we will report only general findings.

      These meetings will be structured in the format that you most prefer. All three of us would like to hear from you, but we are happy to conduct these meetings as one-on-one conversations. If you would prefer, we also may combine faculty so that we have a small group conversation. Please indicate your preferences below.

<div align="center">Best regards,</div>

<div align="center">Lynne Davidson</div>

cc: Frederick Jefferson
      Carol Shuherk

_____   I would prefer to be the only faculty member at this meeting.

_____   I would prefer to be one of several faculty members at this meeting.

. . . .

_____   I am happy to meet with Lynne Davidson, Carol Shuherk, and Frederick Jefferson.

_____   I would prefer to speak only with _____.

<div align="center">(Lynne, Carol, and/or Frederick)</div>

. . . .

_____   Please call me to speak further about this process before you schedule the meeting.