

Report of the Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness

**Submitted to President Joel Seligman
October 10, 2006**

Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness members: Nicholas Bigelow, Raffaella Borasi, Anthea Butler, Maggie Cassie (Staff to the Committee), Patricia Chiverton, Lynne Davidson (Task Force Chair), Mary Dombeck, Bradford Berk, Gerald Gamm, David Guzick, Fredrick Harris, Frederick Jefferson, Ellen Koskoff, Peter Lennie, Vivian Lewis, Charles Murphy, Elissa Newport, Joanna Olmsted, Charles Phelps, Jamal Rossi, Joel Seligman (ex officio), Sue Stewart, Mark Zupan

The Task Force thanks the following for their tremendous contributions: Larry Ansini, Renee Baker (RIT), Eulas Boyd (RIT), Alfreda Brown (RIT), Stan Byrd, Linda Chaudron, Christine Colaluca, Vincenzo Falciano, Jessica Foster, Jean Howard (Columbia University), Leah Merrifield (Washington University), Kathy Miner, Kathleen Moore, Judie Myers-Gell, Beth Olivares, Carol Shuherk, Kathy Sweetland

Executive Summary

The University Board of Trustees and the University's tenth president, Joel Seligman, have expressed a strong commitment to faculty diversity. As an important first step in addressing the issue, President Seligman assembled a Task Force that includes the provost, the senior vice president for health sciences, the senior academic dean of each of the six schools, the chair of the Faculty Senate, and faculty from throughout the University to examine the data, define the obstacles to successful hiring and retention of individuals who contribute to the diversity of the faculty, review the faculty diversity programs at our peer institutions, and recommend a program to address faculty diversity and inclusiveness.

Among the most important findings of the Task Force are the following:

- 1.** There is no single office with resources available to faculty University-wide for addressing issues related to faculty diversity, multiculturalism, and inclusiveness.
- 2.** Though the University has a long history of initiatives addressing diversity, inclusion, and multiculturalism, there is no University-wide method to celebrate this tradition or to celebrate diversity as a virtue and a fact of life.
- 3.** There is no University-wide support to assist deans and department chairs in forming appropriate faculty search committees or to inform search committees themselves on best practices for increasing the diversity of candidate pools and increasing the probability of successfully hiring those who will add to the diversity of our faculty.
- 4.** The intense market competition for quality faculty who are members of groups historically underrepresented in certain academic fields makes it hard in some instances for a department or school to compete without access to central bridge or matching funds, especially when a quality candidate becomes available at a time when a department or school does not have a faculty slot available.
- 5.** Child care demands affect tenure track faculty in unique ways; and many of our peer institutions, in recognizing this struggle, have made

significant policy changes that improve their faculty benefits related to child-birth and child care.

6. Formal, institutional support for overall faculty development at the University is spotty, which compounds the sense of professional and social isolation often experienced by minority group members.
7. There is no regular, comprehensive assessment of our progress towards becoming a more diverse and inclusive institution.

In response, the Task Force proposes 31 recommendations. The successful implementation of our recommendations, we believe, will address the issues outlined above, and many others, that affect our ability to have the diverse faculty that is necessary at a world class research university, and the welcoming environment that all in our community deserve.

The recommendations address four distinct needs: University-wide coordination, a Special Opportunities Fund, family friendly policies, and implementation of best practices.

Recommendations 1 – 16: University-wide Coordination

The first set of recommendations includes those that lead to coordinated programmatic efforts to increase the hiring and retention rates of a diverse faculty throughout the University, as well as those that make the University a more welcoming and inclusive institution.

Recommendation 1: We recommend that the President hire a University faculty diversity officer who would report to the President and Provost. This diversity officer should chair a committee of school-based faculty diversity officers and should have the authority and resources to carry out functions not best done at the school level.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that the University faculty diversity officer establish herself or himself as the default starting point for faculty seeking help on issues of multiculturalism and its advancement.

Recommendation 3: We recommend that all six schools of the University evaluate their faculty orientation programs to ensure that they are fostering a sense of belonging among new faculty and to nurturing that sentiment to

increase faculty commitment to the University of Rochester. The University faculty diversity officer should offer connections to groups representing diversity on campus (e.g., women's groups) as well as the broader Rochester area and help ensure that issues related to diversity are incorporated into orientation for all faculty (i.e. working with a diverse student body, colleagues, staff).

Recommendation 4: We recommend that the University faculty diversity officer work with the Human Resources Manager for Multicultural Affairs and Inclusion and others to create a highly visible and regular time when discussions of diversity and inclusion can take place and ensure that there are events that are exciting, educational, and offered throughout our University and surrounding community.

Recommendation 5: We recommend that consistent and comprehensive education and training standards be established to ensure that all searches for new faculty are inclusive.

Recommendation 6: We recommend the establishment of a central clearing house or central point of contact, 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.

Recommendation 7: We recommend that the Office of the Provost, in coordination with the University faculty diversity officer and Human Resources staff, act as a central point of contact for all deans, department chairs, and faculty who need assistance with faculty spouse or partner hiring.

Recommendation 8: We recommend that the University conduct a periodic survey of faculty to determine the suitability of day care offerings, and that the University investigate the feasibility of establishing an emergency referral service for childcare and eldercare, and determine the demand for operating or contracting a service to provide in-home childcare and eldercare services.

Recommendation 9: We recommend annual reporting on the status, progress, and challenges of diversity and inclusion initiatives to the President, Board of Trustees, and Faculty Senate, and regular web-based

reporting. Reporting should include data on current faculty demographics by school and rank, as well as data on applicants, promotions, and departures.

Recommendation 10: We recommend that the best survey format for eliciting faculty self-identification of race information, as determined by the analysis of the pilot survey, be used for an all-faculty survey, and be regularly updated with new hire data.

Recommendation 11: We recommend the adoption of a University-wide definition of faculty applicant.

Recommendation 12: We recommend that there be training for the administrators in each department who process new hire intake paperwork to help them properly complete the faculty hire Affirmative Action forms (as part of our compliance with the U. S. Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs) and to highlight the importance of this process.

Recommendation 13: We recommend that the Office of the Provost 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.

Recommendation 14: We recommend that the Office of the Provost work with the schools to establish a definition of faculty promotion that will cover all types of faculty promotions across the University, and that this definition be required to be used by all staff who complete University promotion forms.

Recommendation 15: We recommend that the schools conduct systematic exit interviews for all departing faculty.

Recommendation 16: We recommend that an analysis of the cultural climate concerning diversity and inclusiveness be conducted on a school-by-school basis.

Recommendations 17 – 20: Special Opportunities Fund

The second set of recommendations addresses a fund to take advantage of special opportunities in hiring.

Recommendation 17: We recommend that the faculty support fund, with a current budget of \$200,000, be renamed the Special Opportunities Fund, and that it be enlarged, with the aim of enhancing the quality of the University faculty. The Fund will assist the deans and department chairs in the recruiting (or, in special cases, in the retention) of specific faculty candidates who will contribute to the diversity of the faculty and who might otherwise not be recruited successfully because of market competition. We also recommend that the Special Opportunities Fund be available on a competitive basis to departments and schools for the hiring of individual faculty, or clusters of faculty in specified areas, that offer special opportunities for the enhancement of faculty diversity. To accomplish this, \$400,000 should be allocated to the fund in 2007-08, and \$500,000 should be allocated in 2008-09. In the years that follow, the annual contribution to the Fund should be \$500,000 plus an annual percentage increase that is equivalent to the percentage increase of University faculty salaries. This means we would spend a minimum of \$2,400,000 over the next five years.

Recommendation 18: We recommend that this Fund be distributed by the Provost and the University faculty diversity officer. We further recommend that the awards, over time, are distributed to the six schools of the University in a way that roughly approximates the funds contributed, provided that the schools use those awards in accordance with the rules of the Fund.

Recommendation 19: We recommend that the fund continue under these guidelines for the next five years after which time the need for continuing to take gender, race and national origin into account in allocating these resources should be reassessed.

Recommendation 20: Special Opportunities Funds should be made available to schools for only a limited duration and awarded only in cases where the school has presented a well-developed plan for how the faculty member(s) to be hired will fit into its longer term academic goals and budget.

Recommendations 21 – 26: Family Friendly Policies

The third set of recommendations addresses tenure clock and leave policies that are especially relevant to faculty who are starting families, or have other family issues.

Recommendation 21: We recommend that a tenure-track faculty member who becomes a new parent be guaranteed a one-year postponement of promotion or tenure review on the occasion of childbirth or adoption, for a maximum of two extensions (unless the department chair and dean agree to additional extensions).

Recommendation 22: We recommend that a faculty member (except Medical Center clinical faculty) who gives birth during the academic year be entitled to a leave with full salary and benefits for eight weeks (or for a longer period for which she is eligible under the Short-term Disability Policy). In addition, University policy should clearly be stated to encourage a discussion between the faculty member and her department chair concerning any desire on the part of the faculty member to have a modification of part of her regularly assigned duties during the semester of the birth. In the alternative, a faculty member giving birth during the academic year should have the option to choose a full semester (or quarter) leave at one-half salary and full benefits.

Recommendation 23: We recommend that recommendation 22 be applied to Medical Center clinical faculty members with the modification that the extent of the period of possible modified duties or the optional period of half-pay leave that a Medical Center clinical faculty giving birth is given beyond the guaranteed Short-term Disability Policy not be specified since the concept of semesters does not have meaning in the clinical setting. The optional period of half-pay leave or modified duties should be as consistent as possible with the period corresponding to a semester so as to be congruent with these possible benefits offered to non-clinical faculty.

Recommendation 24: We recommend that University policy encourage a discussion between faculty who are new parents and their department chair concerning any desire on the part of the faculty member to have a modification of regularly assigned duties during the semester (or quarter) of the birth or adoption. For Medical Center clinical faculty the period of any

modified duties should be as consistent as possible with the semester of modified duties available to non-clinical faculty.

Recommendation 25: We recommend that new parent faculty members be permitted to request an assignment of duties that would enable them to work part-time at a commensurate reduced salary for a period of up to a year following the birth or adoption of a child.

Recommendation 26: We recommend that the unpaid personal leave policy in the *Faculty Handbook* be rewritten to make clear that a member faculty who wishes unpaid time off for child care purposes may take the leave, and is allowed 12 weeks under the Family Medical Leave Act. We also recommend that the discretionary University Leaves of Absence Policy be briefly explained, and that this include an explanation of the process for seeking approval for a University Leave of Absence of up to 12 months without pay as outlined in Personnel Policy #357.

Recommendations 27 – 31: Best Practices

The fourth set of recommendations addresses the need to adopt best practices across the board for the successful recruitment and retention of *all* faculty.

Recommendation 27: We recommend that the University faculty diversity officer continue to examine best practices for the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty, and for the creation of a welcoming and inclusive environment.

Recommendation 28: We recommend that the University faculty diversity officer work closely with academic leaders and administrators University-wide to coordinate on policies and programs that are beneficial to all faculty who wish to come to or remain at the University of Rochester.

Recommendation 29: We recommend that the responsibility for faculty development remain at the school and department 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.

Recommendation 30: We recommend that each school consider recognizing faculty leadership and mentoring by including them among the factors considered in promotion and reappointment criteria.

Recommendation 31: We recommend that all six schools of the University evaluate the support given to faculty to improve teaching techniques.

Report of the Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness

I. A Rationale for a Strengthened Focus on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness

On February 21, 2006, President Seligman spoke to the University of Rochester Faculty Senate on the topic of faculty diversity and inclusiveness¹. At that time, he reiterated his commitment to diversity, calling it a “fundamental value of this University,” and announced his intention to be the University’s Chief Diversity Officer, and to take “the most effective steps to achieve both academic excellence and diversity.” He stated two relevant goals: “To remedy the historic underrepresentation in our faculties of minorities and, in some fields, of women and to further strengthen an academic environment characterized by excellence.”

To this end, President Seligman also announced at that time the formation of the Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness that would “recommend how we can make our campus the most welcoming and supportive in the hiring, promotion and work environment at the University of Rochester.” The charge to the Task Force is attached here as Appendix 1.

President Seligman is not alone in addressing the issues of diversity on campus. Most recently, the National Academies’ Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering issued a series of recommendations “on how to make the fullest possible use of a large source of our nation’s talent: women in academic science and engineering.” In their September 18, 2006 report, *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering*, the authors recognize that women in science and engineering are lost at every stage of the educational process, and find that this phenomenon cannot be explained by a lack of interest. They cite research on the discrimination that women in science and engineering face, academic evaluation criteria that disadvantage women, and timelines in the tenure process that also disadvantage women. Their recommendations for universities mirror many of those we include here.

¹ http://www.rochester.edu/president/memos/2006/senate_february.html.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), in their report *Faculty Recruitment in Higher Education: Research Findings on Diversity and Affirmative Action*,² asserts that “A diverse faculty will mean better educational outcomes for all students. To serve current and future student populations, multiple and diverse perspectives are needed at every level of college teaching and governance. The more diverse college and university faculty are, the more likely all students will be exposed to a wider range of scholarly perspectives and to ideas drawn from a variety of life experiences.”

Harvard University’s first Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity issued her first report in June 2006. Among other accomplishments in her first year, the new Senior Vice Provost “provided financial support for the recruitment of 20 faculty across the University, further diversifying 14 departments in 9 Schools,” began the process of developing a faculty climate survey, and developed new standards for parental leave guidelines, including paid time off and teaching relief for new parents (Harvard University, Office of the Provost, Faculty Development and Diversity, *End of Year Report 2006*, p.8).³

The presidents of nine of the nation’s leading research universities⁴ issued a joint statement on December 6, 2005 that reads in part “barriers still exist to the full participation of women, not only in science and engineering, but also in academic fields throughout higher education. . . . We acknowledge that there are still significant steps to be taken toward making academic careers compatible with family caregiving responsibilities. Our goal as research universities is to create conditions in which all faculty are capable of the highest level of academic achievement. Continuing to develop academic personnel policies, institutional resources, and a culture that supports family commitments is therefore essential for maximizing the productivity of our faculty. The future excellence of our institutions depends on our ability to provide equitable and productive career paths for all faculty.”

²http://www.diversityweb.org/diversity_innovations/faculty_staff_development/recruitment_tenure_promotion/faculty_recruitment.cfm.

³http://www.faculty.harvard.edu/pdf/fdd_eoy_report_2006.pdf

⁴ The group included the presidents of California Institute of Technology, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton University, Stanford University, University of California, Berkeley, University of Michigan, University of Pennsylvania, and Yale University.

Many of our other peer institutions have made a serious University-wide commitment to faculty diversity in recent years. For example, in 2004, Columbia University hired its first Vice Provost for Diversity Initiatives; in 2005 Washington University hired a Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Diversity Initiatives; Duke University, with diversity initiatives dating back many years, created a new Special Assistant to the Provost for Faculty Diversity and Faculty Development position also in 2005; and the University of Texas at Austin created a vice provost position in May 2005, now with the title of vice president for diversity and community engagement.

The Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness embraces the ideals articulated by President Seligman and the nation's leading academic institutions. The University of Rochester has a long, proud history of inclusion. In 1900, when many institutions were excluding women from their campuses, Susan B. Anthony pledged her life insurance funds to the University of Rochester's endowment in exchange for an agreement from the Board of Trustees that would open the University's door to women. In Miss Anthony's honor, the University established the Susan B. Anthony Center for Women's Studies in 1986 to support the Women's Studies Program and relevant faculty research. Also in 1986, the University established the Frederick Douglass Institute for African and African-American Studies, in honor of Mr. Douglass, who spent 25 years as a prolific writer, speaker and activist in Rochester. The Institute supports education and research in African and African-American studies.

In at least one important respect, the University has done less than it could to build upon this proud history. While other universities have actively recruited women of all races and men of color for their faculties, have worked to create welcoming environments for all faculty, and have celebrated diversity in meaningful ways, the University of Rochester, with often the best intentions, has taken a more passive approach. We now recognize that this approach has not produced as diverse a campus as we believe we should have.

The recommendations in this report address four distinct needs. The first set of recommendations includes those that lead to coordinated programmatic efforts to increase the hiring and retention rates of a diverse faculty throughout the University, as well as those that make the University a more welcoming and inclusive institution. Second, we address the need to restructure and increase the Provost's faculty support fund to take advantage

of special opportunities in hiring. The third set of recommendations addresses tenure clock and leave policies that are especially relevant to faculty who are starting families, or have other family issues. Finally, we address the need to adopt best practices across the board for the successful recruitment and retention of *all* faculty.

II. History of Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives at the University of Rochester

In some respects the University of Rochester history of diversity and inclusion initiatives begins in 1881 when the first African-American, Henry Austin Spencer, was admitted into the freshman class. The story continues in 1900 when Susan B. Anthony convinced the University of Rochester's Board of Trustees that the time had come to admit women into the student body. For the purposes of this Report, however, the significant history begins in 1968 with the creation of the University's Educational Opportunity Program. The following brief historical summary is a distillation of events and recommendations, beginning with 1968, and described in the following University studies and Task Force reports: *Study on Race Relations at the University of Rochester*, The Gifford Report, 1983; *Report of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Minority Issues*, The Eaves Report, 1992; and *Report of the Residential College Commission Sub-Committee On Diversity*, The RCCD Report, 1999.

1968: Educational Opportunity Program. The University established the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and admitted the first cohort of students of color who would receive targeted academic and social support services. These services and programs are administered today through the Office of Minority Student Affairs, (RCCD Report).

1969: Black Students Union Takeover. The Black Students Union led a six-day takeover of the third and fourth floors of the Frederick Douglass Building (the location of the former Faculty Club). Student demands included: hiring of a minority admissions recruiter, recruitment of a greater number of black students, providing black studies in the curriculum, improved services to the local black community, and improved opportunities for the University's own black employees, (RCCD Report).

1973: Review of the Educational Opportunity Program. The University administration undertook a systematic review of the EOP. A

three-member committee consisting of President Sproull, Vice President Dowd and Associate Dean Goldberg headed the effort. In a progress report to the faculty senate in March, Goldberg emphasized appropriate criteria for admission and the merits of the pre-freshman summer program. In July, the administration hired a new EOP director, its fifth in five years, (RCCD Report).

1978: Provost O'Brien Initiatives. From 1979-1981, Provost Richard O'Brien championed the following initiatives: formed a Council For Minority Education; formed a Task Force on Affirmative Action; established closer working relationships with black students in the Black Students Union, as members of the Provost's Undergraduate Council; worked with an Alumni Committee on Minority Enrollment which helped form a close relationship with the Urban League and led to the creation of twenty special scholarships for minority students; helped recruit an outstanding black alumnus, Bernard Gifford, as Vice President for Student Affairs, (RCCD Report).

1983: The Gifford Report, *Study on Race Relations at the University of Rochester.* Over 600 students participated in the study which surveyed pre-university interracial experiences, defensiveness, interracial interactions, prejudices and stereotyping, attitudes about racial groups, and attitudes about University policies and curriculum. The study concluded: "...minority and non-minority freshman students may need an initial period for adjusting to each other. We suggest that the University take steps to aid this adjustment. These steps could include promoting interracial interaction during freshman orientation and during the first weeks of classes....Resident advisors may be particularly useful for this purpose: we therefore recommend that they receive training in skills and techniques for promoting interracial interaction. Minority resident advisors may be particularly useful as role models for both minority and white students: we therefore recommend that their number be increased," (Gifford Report, RCCD).

1984: Community Relations Committee. President Dennis O'Brien appointed a 17 member "Community Relations Committee" consisting of representatives of the black community, alumni, student groups, UR faculty, and administrators to consider the following: African American Studies; recruitment of minority faculty, staff and students; support services; security services; and student judicial procedures. One significant result from the

work of this committee was the creation of the Frederick Douglass Institute, (RCCD).

1989: *Towards the Future of Minority Student Affairs: A Discussion Paper.* The Directors of the Frederick Douglass Institute and the Office of Minority Student Affairs were the principal authors of this paper, which called for a greater integration of effort in all facets of the University in pursuing the goal of achieving a more diverse and welcoming community. The “Discussion Paper” posed the problem as follows: “There is an urgent need to enhance the cultural sensitivity of all students and to increase their sophistication about the diverse human world in which they will live out their lives. Consciously accommodating diversity should also be the business of faculty, administrators, staff members, and service persons – and of all administrative units. It should not be left to OMSA, the Frederick Douglass Institute, the International Student Office, and the Office of University and Community Affairs....The issues surrounding diversity and multicultural community are far too complex for any one office or set of offices alone,” (RCCD).

1992: *The Eaves Report, Report of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Report on Minority Issues.* Proposed by President O’Brien and established by the Faculty Senate in 1990, this committee examined the issue of recruitment and retention of minority graduate students and faculty. The report urged the Faculty Senate, President and administration to develop “systematic oversight and clearly articulated effective incentives” to improve the recruitment and retention of minority faculty and graduate students. The report also urged the development of “mentoring systems” for untenured faculty and improved connections with the Rochester community, (The Eaves Report).

1999: *Student sit-in.* On February 22, 1999, a group of University of Rochester minority undergraduate students, many of them members of the Black Student Union, led a sit-in in the office of Thomas H. Jackson, the University’s ninth president. As a result of that peaceful protest, the University administration agreed to develop a mission statement on diversity, to permanently increase the recruitment of minority students in The College, to appoint students to the Dean’s Advisory Committee on University Programs in African and African American Studies and the Frederick Douglass Institute, to foster increased diversity in academic and cultural programming throughout the University, and to create a plan for the

increased recruitment of minority faculty and staff. Some progress has been made in most of the identified areas; the University has seen very little progress, however, in the area of minority faculty recruitment (see data in section III below).

1999: Report of the Residential College Commission Sub-Committee on Diversity. In March 1999, the Residential College Commission Sub-Committee on Diversity (RCCD) reported on the state of diversity, particularly in the College, and made fifteen recommendations on topics regarding diversity both within the College and University-wide. Of the fifteen recommendations, eight have been implemented, including the creation of a mission statement on diversity, the revitalization of the Frederick Douglass Institute, and the implementation of diversity programming in orientation and residential life.

2005: Statement of Educational Philosophy. In 2005, responding to two Supreme Court decisions in cases involving the University of Michigan, the UR created and the Board of Trustees approved a Statement of Educational Philosophy⁵ that affirms the need for a diverse student body, faculty, and staff at the University of Rochester.

III. The Numbers: A Current Snapshot of the University Faculty

A. Defining “Diversity”

Among the charges to the Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness is to define “diversity.” For the purposes of this report, the Task Force chose to consider the extent to which the faculty is diverse along gender, race, and ethnicity lines. We do not mean to suggest that these are the only important measures of faculty diversity; however, an examination of our faculty data makes clear that diversity by gender, race, and ethnicity is a serious issue facing the University today. We expect that many of our recommendations will lead to greater diversity and further study across other dimensions, such as disability and sexual orientation, as well.

⁵ The Statement of Educational Philosophy is accessible on the Provost’s web page, http://www.rochester.edu/provost/ed_philosophy.html.

B. Defining “Faculty”

Although not charged to define “faculty,” this proved to be an important task for this group. We focused on three possible definitions of faculty:

1. Tenured and tenure track faculty (faculty with the titles of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor). This is the smallest group of the three, with about 1,300 in 2006.
2. Faculty as defined by the Faculty Senate (Appendix 2). Approximately 1,500 faculty members meet this definition in 2006.
3. Faculty as defined by the Human Resources Management System (HRMS). This includes anyone who is not coded as “staff” in HRMS (e.g., post docs, fellows, and residents are in this definition), and is therefore a default definition. This is the largest group of the three, with approximately 2,600 people in 2006.

C. The Data

For simplicity, we chose to use the tenured and tenure track faculty definition in this Report. This is not to imply that our recommendations are intended only for tenured and tenure track faculty. We expect that many of the University’s efforts to increase the diversity and inclusiveness of our faculty can readily be generalized to a broader definition of faculty.

1. Underrepresented Minorities

As President Seligman noted in his February 21 address to the Faculty Senate, our faculty diversity story is an uneven one. In 2006, self-identified African Americans and Hispanics number 30 and account for 2.3 percent of our 1,288 tenured and tenure track faculty (we have no self-identified American Indians among our tenured or tenure track faculty; see Table 1), essentially unchanged from 2000 when the total was 2.3 percent of a slightly smaller population (26 of 1,144 in total in 2000).⁶ Eliminating those with

⁶ Note the addition of a “non-specified” category in 2006. Prior to 2003, the University did not include a “non-specified” category in the personnel data system. All faculty who did not specify race prior to 2003 were coded as white. There may remain some non-whites in the data system who continue to be coded as white.

unknown or not self-identified race from the calculation, 2.6 percent of the faculty are identified as African American or Hispanic.⁷

Differences are also apparent by faculty rank. Of 431 full professors University-wide, four are self-identified African American or Hispanic (0.9 percent). Of 447 assistant professors University-wide, 14 are self-identified African American or Hispanic (3.1 percent). This may be interpreted as a hopeful sign of improvement.

2. Women

The University has witnessed success in increasing the number of women in certain fields. In 2000, 24.9 percent of the University's tenured and tenure track faculty were women; women now make up 28.4 percent of the total (see Table 2). There are differences by school, however. For example, in the Eastman School, which has grown by 15 tenure track faculty since 2000, the population of women faculty grew from 27.4 percent to the current 34.1 percent. The Simon School, on the other hand, has experienced a slight drop in the number of women in the tenure track, falling from 10.4 percent in 2000 to 9.7 percent today.

Once again, the percentages differ significantly by faculty rank as well. Of our current assistant professors, 38.3 percent are women; of our full professors, 17.2 percent are women. These dramatic differences by rank exist in each of the schools except the School of Nursing, where the gender diversity issue is reversed; and the Warner School, where approximately two-thirds of the faculty are women.

3. How We Compare to Our Peers

The Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) Institutional Profiles Project provides peer data on tenured and tenure track faculty headcounts by race and ethnicity by broadly defined disciplines. The report also provides such headcounts by gender. The gender headcounts are further broken down by faculty rank. For this report, COFHE excludes medical school faculties.

⁷ An examination of the data reveals that the choice of faculty definition has very little effect on the percentage of faculty represented by blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians. There are more women, however, as a fraction of the total HRMS faculty than as a fraction of the tenured and tenure track population, with 28 percent.

Many universities report these data to the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) as well. This gives us another peer group comparison.

a. Underrepresented Minorities

In FY 2005, the most recent year for which comparative data are available, 3.5 percent of our University-wide tenured and tenure track faculty (excluding the School of Medicine and Dentistry) were underrepresented minorities. Among the COFHE universities⁸, the median percentage of underrepresented minorities is 6.1 percent (see Table 3)⁹. Relative to this peer set, we have comparatively fewer underrepresented minority faculty in the humanities (4.8 percent at Rochester compared to 9.1 percent at our peer institutions), and in our professional schools¹⁰ (4.0 percent at Rochester compared to 6.5 percent at our peer institutions). Although Rochester appears to employ about the same fraction of minorities in the social sciences as our COFHE peers (8.2 percent for Rochester compared to 8.3 percent for the median of the peer set), these are very small numbers, and the loss of one African American social scientist would bring us down to 6.8 percent.

The COFHE universities, on average, have a less effective record in the hiring and retention of underrepresented minorities compared to other peer sets. For example, at the COFHE colleges,¹¹ of the Arts and Science faculties (which is essentially the entire faculty at these small, primarily undergraduate colleges), the median for underrepresented minorities is 9.5 percent. The median underrepresented minority Arts and Sciences faculty at the COFHE universities is 6.1 percent. At Rochester, 3.5 percent, of the Arts and Sciences faculty are underrepresented minorities.

Universities report the race and gender of their university-wide tenured and tenure track faculties to the U.S. Department of Education.

⁸ In addition to the University of Rochester, COFHE universities include Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Duke, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Georgetown, MIT, Northwestern, Princeton, Rice, Stanford, University of Chicago, University of Pennsylvania, Washington University, and Yale.

⁹ COFHE calculates the percentage of underrepresented minorities using the total tenured and tenure track faculty excluding non-resident aliens.

¹⁰ Here, professional schools include Simon, Warner, Nursing, and Eastman.

¹¹ COFHE colleges are Amherst, Barnard, Bryn Mawr, Carlton, Mount Holyoke, Oberlin, Pomona, Smith, Swarthmore, Trinity, Wellesley, Wesleyan, and Williams.

From this data set, we compared the University of Rochester to the universities in the American Association of Universities (excluding the two Canadian universities for which such data are not reported). For consistency with the COFHE reports, we examined the data after excluding non-resident aliens. Across the entire University (this time including the School of Medicine and Dentistry) the University of Rochester reported an underrepresented minority population of 2.5 percent in the tenured and tenure track faculty in 2005. The median for the AAU peer set was 6.1 percent (see Table 4).

b. Women

In FY 2005, 26 percent of the University of Rochester's University-wide faculty (excluding the School of Medicine and Dentistry) were women. Among COFHE universities, the median was 29 percent (Table 3). Again, these differences differ by discipline. In the humanities, 36 percent of the University of Rochester faculty is women; for our COFHE university peers, 43 percent of the humanities faculty is women. Comparisons of women faculty to the COFHE colleges peer set would be inappropriate in this case since the COFHE colleges group includes women's colleges.

The Department of Education, however, once again provides a useful comparison set, and in this case, we compare very well. University-wide (including the School of Medicine and Dentistry), the University of Rochester reported that 27.1 percent of tenured and tenure track faculty were women in FY 2005. Among our AAU peer set, the median in that year was 27.5 percent (Table 4).

IV. Current Efforts in the Schools to Address Diversity and Inclusiveness for Faculty

There are many efforts at the school level devoted to the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty, some of which are described here.

In the College, all departments were asked in 2000 to prepare documents that addressed efforts made in faculty recruiting to increase diversity; information on where departments advertise for candidates, and the professional meetings attended for recruitment; the mechanisms by

which minority candidates have been successfully identified; and any outreach activities employed for identifying potential faculty candidates who are underrepresented. To attempt to increase the likelihood that diverse faculty will be recruited, the Dean's office has asked departments that are in the process of searching about their attempts to identify candidates that will enhance diversity. If a list of candidates to be invited to campus shows no diversity, departments have been asked explicitly about the position of any minority (or women) candidates in the evaluation process. The Dean's office also has authorized off-cycle recruitment due to the availability of a candidate that would enhance diversity.

As is the case for any valued faculty member, chairs and the deans have worked proactively to enhance the likelihood that minority faculty will be retained (e.g., shifting the timing of academic leaves to best accommodate scholarly opportunities; generating competitive pre-emptive offers). In the last few years, the restructuring and resurgence of the Frederick Douglass Institute, with programs that include visitors, predoc and postdoc fellowship opportunities, has been an asset in making the College commitment to minorities and minority scholarship more visible. Similarly, the Susan B. Anthony Institute and organizations such as Women in Science and Engineering are cited as important in providing venues in which scholarly and career issues related to gender can be discussed.

In the School of Medicine and Dentistry, a faculty panel concerned with the recruitment and retention of women and minorities delivered a report to the Dean in November 2005. Their major recommendations, which the School is in the process of implementing, include a faculty development program with a focus on junior women and minority faculty; a quarterly meeting that will serve as an open forum for all minority and women faculty, provide an opportunity for networking, and serve to identify issues that affect the academic development of the participants; and Dean's Committee for Career Development for Women and Minorities. And on September 1, 2006, the School announced the creation of two new positions: the Associate Dean for Faculty Development-Medical Education, and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development-Women and Diversity.

In the School of Nursing, each semester since 2002, a cultural sensitivity course has been offered to faculty and staff. The School formed a diversity committee in the fall of 2005, and immediately began implementing a series of additional diversity initiatives for faculty. Faculty

are now required to attend a diversity discussion group each year, usually following the viewing of a relevant movie or reading a relevant article. New efforts to recruit minority faculty include advertisements in the *Journal for the American Black Nurses Association*, enlisting minority faculty representation on search committees, and contacting schools noted for successful minority enrollment to discuss strategies and help identify additional candidates.

V. Current Efforts at the University to Address Diversity and Inclusiveness for Staff and Students

A. Staff

Stan Byrd joined the University of Rochester in January 2005 as the Human Resources Manager for Multicultural Affairs and Inclusion. His role is to consult with and support University administration on issues of diversity and inclusion related to staff. His work includes collaborating with Human Resources staff and representatives to enhance their efforts to integrate issues of diversity and inclusion into all aspects of service delivery and training programs. Stan works directly with units and departments and also supports staff recruitment and retention efforts University-wide.

His efforts have strengthened the University's ability to better manage staff workplace issues related to diversity and inclusion. Stan has worked with several departments directly and has supported Human Resources personnel to develop diversity and inclusion strategies as requested. He has collaborated with the HR Development office to infuse information about diversity and inclusion throughout the Leadership Development Program.

In September 2005, Judie Myers-Gell, Multicultural Recruitment Specialist, was hired to develop a multicultural strategic recruitment program with the goal of increasing diversity among the Professional, Administrative, and Supervisory (PAS) Staff, Pay Grade 50 and above.

Stan Byrd, Charles Murphy (Associate Vice President for Human Resources), Kathy Sweetland (Intercessor), Frederick Jefferson (Professor Emeritus and Intercessor) and Judie Myers-Gell served on a Diversity Site Visit benchmarking team that visited three major universities. A report was

presented to President Seligman highlighting university-wide best practices related to faculty and senior administration searches, as well as staff and student initiatives. Two members of this group have served on the Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness, and the other three have provided ongoing support and consultation to the Task Force.

Stan has researched and developed new content for the University's Diversity web page, which he updates with new information on an ongoing basis. Stan is coordinating with Information Technology Services to develop a method for members of the University community easily to display a reminder about cultural events and holidays on their University Outlook calendars.

Stan has provided support and guidance to employees interested in starting Affinity Groups. Three groups have been formed and have created by-laws: the African-American Network, the Latino Network, and the Pride Alliance. A brochure that publicizes the existence of the Affinity Groups and encourages people to join a group and become allies has been developed.

Goals for the near future include working with the Communications Office to develop a plan to publicize and celebrate staff recruitment and inclusion initiatives, the development of a "school to work" program in collaboration with the Rochester City School District, development of a "Managing Diversity" leadership training module, development of a Human Resources Diversity and Inclusion Council to serve as a strategic partner to other departments looking to establish councils or task forces on diversity, creation of a template for including diversity and inclusion in performance appraisals for staff and managers, and the development of a mentoring program for individuals hired under the PAS Grade 50+ initiative.

B. Students

Programs and policies that address diversity and inclusion in our student population are generally within the schools, rather than at the University level. For example:

The **Simon School** is setting a national trend by aiming to create a more diverse student body -- attracting the best and brightest prospective students without requiring a set number of years of prior work experience of

all of its M.B.A. applicants. This has shown to be an especially attractive option for women students, but also has shown to attract more African Americans and Hispanics than those MBA programs that emphasize additional years of work experience prior to entrance into the program.

The School of Medicine and Dentistry's Center for Advocacy, Community Health, Education and Diversity (CACHED) recruits students from diverse backgrounds and administers programs designed to expand the pool of students who might consider pursuing careers in medicine. The Center supports a wide variety of undergraduate and graduate school outreach programs, providing clinical, research and teaching opportunities outside the formal medical education setting which help to educate the medical school community about cultural, environmental, socioeconomic, and other factors that impact the health of populations.

The Warner School of Graduate Education and Human Development offers the Urban Teaching and Leadership (UTL) Program, a comprehensive approach to recruiting, preparing, and providing professional development for teachers and leaders in the Rochester City School District. The goal of the UTL program is to prepare urban educators who have the courage and conviction to lead struggles for social justice. This program includes a full scholarship program for University of Rochester undergraduates committed to teach in urban settings. Recipients of the award will include individuals who are able to increase the diversity of the urban teacher population or increase the number of certified teachers in specializations where there are the highest shortages in the Rochester area.

The Eastman School of Music sponsors Eastman Pathways, a unique program that provides outstanding Rochester City School District students with scholarships to pursue music studies at Eastman. Pathways lessons and course offerings are meant to enrich what is taught in the City Schools. Up to 75 students participate each year with an enrollment goal of achieving a student population that reflects the ethnic mix of the Rochester City Schools.

At the **School of Nursing**, students in the *Fuld Scholars Program* are expected to participate in selected leadership activities, including the Action for Health: Improving Clinical Prevention Services in Neighborhood Health Centers program. This project allows students to participate in a continuous cycle of community needs assessment that gives them an opportunity to

identify community leaders, set feasible goals, develop improvement plans, perform interventions, and evaluate outcomes.

In **The College**, the College Diversity Roundtable (CDR) is a student-centered task force where campus climate and quality of life issues and concerns can be voiced, heard and acted upon, especially those affecting racial, ethnic, and cultural groups on campus. The Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP), Office of Minority Student Affairs, supports students who are low-income and in need of additional academic support. The five-year graduation rate for HEOP students rivals the College's average five-year rate. The Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program's goal is to increase the numbers of low-income, first-generation, and underrepresented minority students who pursue doctoral degrees. Within one year of graduation, 72.5 percent of Rochester McNair scholars have entered graduate study. By way of comparison, the national average for graduate school attendance is about 10 percent (less for students of color), and the national average for McNair Program completers is about 35 percent.

The **admissions** offices of all six schools of the University are engaged in ongoing efforts that are designed to increase the diversity of their student populations. For example, the College Admissions and Financial Aid offices this year have greatly expanded diversity outreach, adding three full-time staff positions for Rochester youth programs, expanded activity in New York City, and deepening our long-term partnerships with national community-based organizations.

VI. Programs at Peer Institutions

During the 2005-06 academic year, a group of University staff¹² visited three peer Universities (Michigan, Columbia, and Syracuse) and two Rochester area schools (RIT and St. John Fisher) at the recommendation of President Seligman to collect information about university-wide best practices in the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty. (This site visit team also collected information about staff and student initiatives.) The site visit team found that efforts at these schools were concentrated around establishing reliable data collection methods, training and oversight of faculty search committees, standardized recruitment processes, financial

¹² Stan Byrd, Frederick Jefferson, Charles Murphy, Judie Myers-Gell, and Kathy Sweetland.

support for diversity hires, special efforts to mentor new minority faculty, and increased assistance to help with dual career hires.

Further study has shown that active university-wide programs for the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty are not unusual among our peers. By searching the web sites of the 25 other private member universities of the American Association of Universities, we know that 13 have a senior faculty diversity officer, most of whom report to the president, chancellor, or provost (see Appendix 3). Several other schools have university-wide committees devoted to issues of faculty diversity and inclusion.

As noted in section IV above, the University of Rochester has several notable school-based initiatives devoted to the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty; however, the absence of university-wide initiatives devoted to the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty at the University of Rochester puts the University at a distinct disadvantage. Our ability to be the best university that we can be is hampered by our inability to recruit and retain the best faculty, and we cannot recruit and retain the best if our peer institutions are making efforts in areas that we are not.

VII. Our Findings and Recommendations

A. University-wide Coordination

Finding: With the creation of a Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness, the University leadership has signaled a commitment to measurably advance the institution towards becoming a truly multicultural university. To realize this goal, we identify two essential tasks. The first is to create structures that will be the focal point for faculty diversity initiatives. The second is to visibly institutionalize the University's commitment.

Recommendation 1: We recommend that the President hire a University faculty diversity officer who would report to the President and Provost. This diversity officer should chair a committee of school-based faculty diversity officers and should have the authority and resources to carry out functions not best done at the school level. The person in this position will provide leadership across the entire University that will harness the commitment of the entire community, from students, faculty, and staff to University trustees and the Rochester community. Some members of the committee feel strongly that this officer should be a tenured faculty member

(in addition to having appropriate administrative skills and experience), in order to ensure that the person will have the respect of the faculty in handling sensitive issues regarding faculty searches and faculty development.

By creating a single, high-level position that is close to the President, it will be clear that faculty diversity and inclusiveness are institutional priorities that reach to the “top.” Further, it also will be clear that the University recognizes the intensity of the effort required to become a leader in the effort to change the culture. By residing at the center of the University’s structure, the University faculty diversity officer will be able to create a coherent effort across the entire institution. One of the fundamental challenges will be to do this in a manner that respects the University’s fundamentally decentralized character. We therefore foresee that there will be comparable efforts within each school. Each of the University’s six schools will have responsibility for implementing many of the programs and processes that are recommended in this report, and for coordinating with the University’s faculty diversity officer as appropriate.

The University faculty diversity officer should conduct a comprehensive review of the many existing successful efforts within the University and will also seek out areas of weakness and deficiency.

Together with the President, the deans and existing community experts, the University faculty diversity officer will then need to define areas of responsibility that do and do not belong within the office, identifying tasks and projects that are University-wide in character and are therefore naturally best handled near the center, including responsibilities that benefit from economies of scale; and those that are optimally handled in the units, either because of unit-specific needs or to preserve existing and successful activities.

The Task Force has taken the first step to identify specific tasks and the focus of responsibility for those tasks. In some cases, we suggest that the responsibility fall entirely with the schools and departments; in some cases the responsibility should rest with the University faculty diversity officer; but in most cases, the responsibility should be shared between the departments, the schools, and the University. We divide these responsibilities into five categories: the face of faculty diversity for the University, celebrating diversity University- and community-wide, search

committee support, family issues for faculty, and assessment and reporting.¹³

1. The Face of Faculty Diversity for the University

a. Point of Contact

Finding: There is no single “go-to” place for addressing issues related to faculty diversity, multiculturalism and inclusiveness. For example, when a faculty member is looking for support in deepening the learning experience for her or his students in diversity and inclusion, there are no obvious University-wide mechanisms available to obtain such help.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that the University faculty diversity officer establish herself or himself as the default starting point for faculty seeking help on issues of multiculturalism and its advancement. The office need not be the point of resolution of all possible needs but must be capable of guiding a person or issue through to resolution.

b. Addressing Isolation

Finding: Informal obstacles to faculty development relate in large part to those factors important in creating a sense of identification and belonging to the greater university community. There is no consistent University process to orient and welcome new faculty to the academic community in a social and intellectual sense. Once here, lack of critical mass, and limited social and academic networks often compound the sense of isolation. Such informal networks can provide opportunities for professional collaboration, outlets to voice concerns and get feedback, and opportunities for social interaction.

Recommendation 3: We recommend that all six schools of the University evaluate their faculty orientation programs to ensure that they are fostering a sense of belonging among new faculty and nurturing that sentiment to increase faculty commitment to the University of Rochester. Schools should work with the Office of the Provost and the University faculty diversity officer to develop programs to welcome new faculty that

¹³ Note that we have not proposed a job title here, but instead have described a job function, and have left the choice of an appropriate job title to the President and Provost.

include: introduction to faculty governance, faculty regulations, and new faculty hospitality. The University faculty diversity officer should offer connections to groups representing diversity on campus (e.g., women's groups) as well as the broader Rochester area and help ensure that issues related to diversity are incorporated into orientation for all faculty (i.e. working with a diverse student body, colleagues, staff).

2. Celebrating Diversity at the University and in the Community

Finding: Though the University has a long history of initiatives addressing diversity, inclusion, and multiculturalism, there is no university-wide method to celebrate this tradition or indeed to celebrate diversity as a virtue and a fact of life.

Recommendation 4: We recommend that the University faculty diversity officer work with the Human Resources Manager for Multicultural Affairs and Inclusion and others to create a highly visible and regular time when discussions of diversity and inclusion can take place and ensure that there are events that are exciting, educational, and offered throughout our University and surrounding community. These conversations and events should reaffirm our commitment to diversity in all of its expressions.

3. Search Committee Support

Finding: Many searches for new faculty members are directed by individuals with great expertise in a given area of scholarship or a given profession. But in the current environment, many members of our University community who strive for greater diversity among faculty candidate pools and successful candidates are on their own to find the resources to help them accomplish this. There is no University-wide support to assist deans and department chairs in forming appropriate faculty search committees or to inform search committees themselves on best practices for increasing the diversity of candidate pools and increasing the probability of successfully hiring those who will add to the diversity of our faculty. Furthermore, our decentralized style has imparted a strong sense of autonomy to our faculty and any changes that might be perceived as threatening this autonomy will not come easily.

Recommendation 5: We recommend that consistent and comprehensive education and training standards be established to ensure that

all searches for new faculty are inclusive. The primary burden of implementation of best practices in faculty diversity recruitment and hiring should be on the schools; however, the University faculty diversity officer should provide appropriate support and resources as necessary to assist schools and departments that are uninformed about best practices in faculty diversity hiring. This support will take into account the differences in recruiting and hiring practices across the University, as well as the highly decentralized nature of our institution. The University faculty diversity officer should report annually to the President and Provost on each school's use of best practices in faculty diversity recruitment and hiring.

4. Family Issues for Faculty

a. Information-Sharing on Child Care, Schools, Real Estate, and the Community

Finding: The University does not have a central place to assist schools and departments with new hires and potential new hires who need information about or assistance with family and personal issues, such as child care or elder care, real estate, local schools, community cultural organizations, etc. This issue is relevant to all faculty, not just those from underrepresented groups; however, our failure to provide information of this type to women and minorities that we have hired or are attempting to hire is especially harmful to our success in attracting and retaining those individuals.

Recommendation 6: We recommend the establishment of a central clearing house or central point of contact, 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. The Task Force understands that the University of Rochester Office of Human Resources already maintains and disseminates much of this information for staff; therefore, we recommend that primary responsibility for this activity remain in Human Resources. We also recommend, however, that Human Resources coordinate with the University faculty diversity officer on relevant issues pertaining to the recruitment and hiring of a diverse faculty.

b. Spouse and Partner Hiring

Finding: The University does not have a central place to assist schools and departments with new hires and potential new hires who need information about or assistance with spouse or partner employment.

Recommendation 7: We recommend that the Office of the Provost, in coordination with the University faculty diversity officer and Human Resources staff, act as a central point of contact for all deans, department chairs, and faculty who need assistance with faculty spouse or partner hiring. The Office of the Provost and the University faculty diversity officer should develop a process for systematic information sharing across schools about spouses and partners who need jobs, as well as available jobs across the University.¹⁴

c. University-Provided Day Care

Finding: The University operates one oversubscribed child daycare center.

Recommendation 8: We recommend that the University conduct a periodic survey of faculty to determine the suitability of day care offerings. We also recommend that the University investigate the feasibility of establishing an emergency referral service for childcare and eldercare, and determine the demand for operating or contracting a service to provide in-home childcare and eldercare services.

5. Faculty Diversity Assessment and Reporting

Finding: There is no regular, comprehensive assessment of our progress towards becoming a more diverse and inclusive institution. The importance of assessment reaches far beyond the generation of “numbers and benchmarks” in that it induces open conversation about the subject and reflects an ongoing commitment that imparts a culture of awareness and accountability.

¹⁴ The University of Rochester has joined the Upstate New York Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (UNY-HERC), a web-based tool that will allow all of the member colleges and universities in Upstate New York to share faculty job openings. The Office of the Provost is the University’s liaison to UNY-HERC.

Recommendation 9: We recommend annual reporting on the status, progress, and challenges of diversity and inclusion initiatives to the President, Board of Trustees, and Faculty Senate, and regular web-based reporting. Reporting should include data on current faculty demographics by school and rank, as well as data on applicants, promotions, and departures. Additional assessment tools are discussed in Appendix 4.

a. Faculty Data

Finding: The University does not have complete and accurate race and ethnicity data for current faculty. There are at least two reasons for this. First, more individuals each year choose to not identify their race on hiring forms. On the University's current Human Resources Management System (HRMS) that houses demographic information, those who choose to not identify race are coded as "race unidentified." The trend to not identify is not unique to the University of Rochester, but has been noted nationwide. Second, before 2003, when individuals failed to identify their race on hiring forms, for purposes of coding on the personnel system, their race was indicated as "white." Those individuals continue to be coded as white on the current system. The Task Force has designed a pilot on-line survey of faculty that asks faculty members to identify their race(s) and gender (Appendix 5). The data from the pilot survey will help us determine the best question format for identifying faculty race.

Recommendation 10: We recommend that the best survey format for eliciting faculty self-identification of race information, as determined by the analysis of the pilot survey, be used for an all-faculty survey, and be regularly updated with new hire data.

b. Applicant Data

Finding: The Office of the Provost asks all academic departments to fill out and submit an Affirmative Action form for all faculty hires (Appendix 6). This form is intended to capture the gender, race and ethnicity of all applicants for faculty positions. The aggregate applicant data are inaccurate and incomplete for several reasons. First, unsuccessful applicants are rarely asked to identify their gender, race, and ethnicity, leaving department staff to complete the Affirmative Action forms using guesswork, or when possible, visual inspection. Second, there is not a consistent University-wide definition of "applicant."

Recommendations 11 - 13:

11. We recommend the adoption of a University-wide definition of **faculty applicant** as one who submits written material – normally at least a letter and a curriculum vitae – expressing interest in a posted faculty position and who has the degree requirements (typically, for example, a PhD in a specific field or fields, or appropriate degree, post-graduate clinical training and relevant licensure for clinical faculty) listed in the job posting.

12. We recommend that there be training for the administrators in each department who process new hire intake paperwork to help them properly complete the faculty hire Affirmative Action forms (as part of our compliance with the U. S. Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs), and to highlight the importance of this process. This training should include explanation of the new definition of applicant.

13. We recommend that the Office of the Provost 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. The expectation is that the schools and departments will find appropriate methods for obtaining the data. The Office of the Provost and the University faculty diversity officer should provide useful information about data collection techniques that are shown to work well in other contexts.

c. Promotions

Finding: Faculty promotions are not accurately captured in HRMS because some promotions are coded as “transfers” on personnel action forms.

Recommendation 14: We recommend that the Office of the Provost work with the schools to establish a definition of faculty promotion that will include all types of faculty promotions across the University, and that this definition be required for all staff who complete University promotion forms.

d. Departures

Finding: There are no University-wide data that can help us understand the reasons for faculty departures. Such data may help us determine if women or underrepresented minority faculty leave the University for different reasons than other faculty.

Recommendation 15: We recommend that the schools conduct systematic exit interviews for all departing faculty.

e. Climate Study

Finding: Each school within the University has a unique culture and, over time, each school has dealt in its own way with issues of diversity and inclusiveness. However, there has never been a systematic examination of the underlying cultural values of the differing components of the University. A school-by-school climate analysis would help determine where and how to approach increasing diversity and inclusiveness in each school and at the University more generally.

Recommendation 16: We recommend that an analysis of the cultural climate concerning diversity and inclusiveness be conducted on a school-by-school basis. The findings from this study will enable us to better determine appropriate actions to take and where to take them.

Estimated Cost of University-Wide Coordination, recommendations 1-16

Many of the recommendations described here will incur minimal costs (although there will be costs associated with the University faculty diversity officer).

B. Special Opportunities Fund

Findings: Under our decentralized organization of funding of faculty hiring and retention, decisions can be made by a department solely on the basis of what is the best opportunity for the unit in terms of both financial resources available and the quality of the candidates (or the current faculty if the issue is retention). The intense market competition for quality faculty who are members of groups historically underrepresented in certain academic fields makes it hard in some instances for a department or school

to compete. In addition, a quality candidate who would enhance diversity can become known to a department or school that does not currently have a faculty slot available. Centrally available bridge or supplemental incentive matching funds would help assure that the broader goals of the University and the President to enhance diversity in the faculty can be met in these circumstances. In addition, programs of disproportionate interest to students and faculty from traditionally underrepresented groups will attract faculty from underrepresented groups and are an appropriate gender- and race-neutral approach to increasing the diversity and inclusiveness of the University.

The centralization of such incentive funds is analogous to payment into an insurance fund. In this case, the purpose is to make available resources for supplements to achieve an important broad educational goal when special opportunities arise.

The intense competition with other academic institutions for qualified candidates from historically underrepresented groups in many fields requires the University of Rochester to meet financial packages offered by others and to take advantage of hiring qualified faculty when they become available, in addition to engaging in gender- and race-neutral practices such as recruiting, benefit enhancement and mentoring. From our research, we believe that it is necessary for the University in some, but not all, instances at the present time to take gender, race and national origin into account, along with other factors enhancing quality and diversity, in allocating resources for hiring and retention to achieve the University's academic goal of increasing faculty diversity. We also recognize that at times a desirable candidate is offered a faculty position, and would accept if there was a funded faculty position available at the University for the candidate's partner or spouse.

The Provost currently administers a faculty support fund, with a budget of \$200,000 per year, used for diversity enhancement, by providing a bridge contribution to hiring or a contribution to startup and that will help to induce an identified faculty candidate to come to the University when market competition has made additional resources an issue. These same funds are very occasionally used toward retention of faculty with similar characteristics who have offers from other institutions that might lead to their departure.

Recommendations 17-20:

17. We recommend that the faculty support fund, with a current budget of \$200,000, be renamed the Special Opportunities Fund, and that it be enlarged, with the aim of enhancing the quality of the University faculty. This Fund will assist the deans and department chairs in the recruiting (or, in special cases, in the retention) of specific faculty candidates who will contribute to the diversity of the faculty and who might otherwise not be recruited successfully because of market competition. Funds should continue to be used for assisting in the hiring or retention of specifically identified candidates or to provide supplement support to permit hiring of the faculty spouse or partner of such candidate. We also recommend that the Special Opportunities Fund be available on a competitive basis to departments and schools for the hiring of individual faculty, or clusters of faculty in specified areas, that offer special opportunities for the enhancement of faculty diversity. These funds should be particularly for, though not limited to, proposals to search for individual faculty who will enhance diversity in the University and that have an unusually meritorious plan for how to achieve this goal; and proposals that create or expand an academic area of study and research that may attract the interest of clusters of faculty and/or students who will enhance overall University educational goals of inclusion and diversity. To accomplish this, \$400,000 should be allocated to the fund in 2007-08, and \$500,000 should be allocated in 2008-09. In the years that follow, the annual contribution to the Fund should be \$500,000 plus an annual percentage increase that is equivalent to the percentage increase of University faculty salaries. This means we would spend a minimum of \$2,400,000 over the next five years.

18. We recommend that this Fund be distributed by the Provost and the University faculty diversity officer. We further recommend that the awards, over time, are distributed to the six schools of the University in a way that roughly approximates the funds contributed, provided that the schools use those awards in accordance with the rules of the Fund.

19. We recommend that the Fund continue under these guidelines for the next five years after which time the need for continuing to take gender, race and national origin into account in allocating these resources should be reassessed. All decisions to hire or retain specific faculty members should be made at the school or departmental level without taking gender, race or national origin into account in any fashion. Only in such cases where

selection of specific faculty to be hired or retained has occurred in a gender-, race- and national origin-neutral way already (or is promised to be undertaken in the case of new programs) should supplemental funding to permit meeting market competitive financial packages or to establish new programs designed to attract the interest of underrepresented faculty and students be funded from the Special Opportunities Fund.

20. Special Opportunities Funds should be made available to schools for only a limited duration and awarded only in cases where the school has presented a well-developed plan for how the faculty member(s) to be hired will fit into its longer term academic goals and budget.

Estimated Cost of the Special Opportunities Fund, recommendations 17-20

At least \$2,400,000 should be provided to the Special Opportunities Fund over the next five years (\$400,000 in 2007-08, \$500,000 in 2008-09, and, in the years that follow, \$500,000 plus an annual percentage increase that is equivalent to the percentage increase of University faculty salaries). We also recommend that the University seek outside funding to increase the size of the Special Opportunities Fund beyond the amount requested here. This may be done through donor support (annual giving or endowment) or a foundation or government grant.

C. Family Friendly Policies for Faculty

While child care demands impact all employees with families, faculty are affected in unique ways because of the nature of a faculty job – especially tenure-track positions, where “the years during which scholars are under the most pressure to produce work of extraordinary high quality are also the same years those individuals are, or wish to be, starting families” (from Harvard’s *Guidelines for Faculty Maternity and Parental Leaves*, July 2006). Giving birth to a child and breast-feeding also have further physical implications for female faculty, and these additional challenges need to be taken into consideration to improve the probability that the University will retain those faculty (especially when tenure is involved).

In the past few years, several research universities have made major strides in improving their faculty benefits related to child-birth and child care. Therefore, a major concern of the Task Force, in addition to ensuring

greater gender equity, is to enable the University of Rochester to hire and retain quality faculty by remaining competitive with respect to its child-related faculty benefits.

These recommendations are informed by a benchmarking analysis that looked at “family-friendly” faculty benefits and policies in a set of peer universities (Brown, Dartmouth, Duke, Emory, Northwestern, Stanford, Penn, Vanderbilt, Washington University, and Yale) as well as in a set of universities currently considered as particularly “family-friendly” (Harvard, MIT, Ohio State, Penn State, University of California System, University of Illinois, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina, and University of Wisconsin).

The information gathered revealed that the University of Rochester is usually towards the “bottom of the pile” in terms of its child-related faculty benefits. (See Appendix 7 for extensive benchmarking of family friendly policies.)

As department chairs, deans, legal and HR staff, we also have brought to these recommendations our own experiences with respect to child-related issues and their impact on faculty hiring, success and retention.

These recommendations should apply to all faculty members at 50 percent or more effort and salary. In articulating the proposed policies, we were very conscious of the cost implications of better child-related faculty benefits, and tried to reach a compromise between minimizing cost increases to the University and remaining competitive with peer universities for faculty hiring and retention.¹⁵

1. Tenure Clock Extension for New Parents

Current University policy states, “A faculty member who has primary child care responsibility is entitled, on request to the department chair, to a one-year postponement of promotion or tenure review” (*University of Rochester Faculty Handbook, p.30*).

¹⁵ Several of the recommendations could be adapted to address a number of other situations that may temporarily impair a faculty member in his or her job, such as dealing with a serious illness, the need to care for elderly or sick parents, children or partner, the need to care for a child with disabilities, or a life-changing event such as divorce, death of a close relative, etc. We have not explored these potential extensions of these recommendations, but we encourage the University to do so.

Findings: The wording of the current policy is ambiguous. It is not clear whether a one year extension can be asked for each newborn or adopted child or only once. Further, the implications in terms of the timing of forthcoming evaluations are not clearly spelled out in our current policy, and they have created confusion and inconsistency in interpretation.

Based on the results of a 2005 research study by the Center for the Education of Women, asking faculty proactively to ask for a tenure-clock extension may be a deterrent, and create hardship for faculty in departments that may be less sympathetic to the needs of the parent of an infant.¹⁶

Recommendation 21: We recommend that a tenure-track faculty member who becomes a new parent¹⁷ be guaranteed a one-year postponement of promotion or tenure review on the occasion of childbirth or adoption, for a maximum of two extensions (unless the department chair and dean agree to additional extensions). The faculty member's review (whether three-year reappointment, promotion or tenure evaluation) will take place a year later than it would have without the extension. The faculty member may waive extension of promotion or tenure consideration, but must do so in writing addressed to the department chair and dean.

2. Modified Duties for New Parents: Birth Mother

Current University policy states, "Faculty members giving birth during the academic year are entitled to a leave of up to eight weeks, with appropriate medical documentation. An alternative, available regardless of the time of the year of the birth, is a full semester's leave at one-third pay, taken either in the semester of birth or the next one following." (*University of Rochester Faculty Handbook*, p.60.) The policy is explained further. The eight weeks paid leave represents the common duration of temporary disability certified by doctors for childbirth. "Should the medical disability associated with childbearing exceed eight weeks, the faculty member will receive disability pay for the longer period certified by the doctor up to the

¹⁶ Waltman, J and August, L. "Tenure Clock, Modified Duties, And Sick Leave Policies: Creating 'A Network of Support and Understanding' For University of Michigan Faculty Women During Pregnancy and Childbirth," The Center for the Education of Women, 2005, (<http://www.umich.edu/~cew/PDFs/pubs/TC-MD%20Report%207-05.pdf>).

¹⁷ For purposes of this set of recommendations, "new parent" is a father or mother of a new-born child, the spouse of the parent of a new-born child, or the adoptive parent of a child who is 2-years-old or younger and has been adopted within the year, but only in all these cases if the child is living within the same household.

maximum for which she is eligible according to her years of University service, as set forth under ‘Short-term Disability.’” The Short-term Disability Policy provides that full salary can continue from two months to a year, depending on the years of service at the University. The alternative of taking a semester leave at one-third pay is explained as representing the rough equivalent of temporary disability payments for childbirth that would normally be certified by a physician paid out over the semester.

If the faculty member chooses the eight-week paid leave option, the unit pays for up to the first entire month of short-term disability (i.e., for five to eight weeks); if the faculty member chooses the leave for the entire semester at one-third pay, the total salary is paid by the benefit pool.

And, “If arrangements can be made without serious impact on the academic program, women faculty may be able to work out with their deans and department chair reduced teaching loads in the semester after childbirth by transferring classes and other duties to the previous semester or the following semester.” (*University of Rochester Faculty Handbook*, p.61.)

Findings: An eight-week leave may be insufficient to accommodate a new mother’s need for recovery and/or choice to breastfeed. For teaching faculty, the absence of the course instructor for up to eight weeks out of a 15-week semester (or a 10-week quarter) is disruptive to students and therefore in most cases, deans and department chairs will need to find (and pay for) someone else to assume the major responsibility for the courses assigned to that faculty member for the semester (or quarter) when the birth occurs.

While the option to take a full semester of leave at one-third pay may be more desirable for the department (as it frees up funds to help pay a substitute course instructor), this option appears to have little value for most faculty members, as it is rarely used (a total of eight new mothers in the University used this option over the last five years). Further, from the perspective of the faculty member, it is difficult to understand the rationale for setting the pay at one-third when approximately one-half of the semester (eight weeks) is guaranteed at full pay. If the faculty member chooses to take leave for the remainder of that semester, she might assume that she is giving up the other one-half of her salary for that semester, not two-thirds.

There is some confusion about the timing of semester leave associated with the language, “An alternative, available regardless of the time of the year of the birth, is a full semester’s leave at one-third pay, taken either in the semester of birth or the next one following.”

Recommendations 22 – 23:

Recommendation 22: General Rule

We recommend that a faculty member (except Medical Center clinical faculty) who gives birth during the academic year be entitled to a leave with full salary and benefits for eight weeks (or for a longer period for which she is eligible under the Short-term Disability Policy). In addition, University policy should clearly be stated to encourage a discussion between the faculty member and her department chair concerning any desire on the part of the faculty member to have a modification of part of her regularly assigned duties during the semester of the birth.¹⁸ Any modification of duties must accommodate the reasonable needs of the department and school and be approved as far in advance as possible of the start of the semester by the department chair and dean. In the alternative, a faculty member giving birth during the academic year should have the option to choose a full semester (or quarter) leave at one-half salary and full benefits. It is important for faculty to discuss their plans and preferences with their department chair and dean well in advance of the start of the semester. (The current policy for faculty on term appointments should continue unchanged.) The schools will need to clarify the implementation of this recommendation in the case of those whose salaries are paid primarily through external funding.

Recommendation 23: Medical Center Clinical Faculty

We recommend that recommendation 22 be applied to Medical Center clinical faculty members with the modification that the extent of the period of possible modified duties or the optional period of half-pay leave that a Medical Center clinical faculty giving birth is given beyond the guaranteed Short-term Disability Policy not be specified since the concept of semesters

¹⁸ For the purposes of this set of recommendations, “During the semester of birth” means (a) the semester, or quarter in the case of schools using quarters, in which the birth or adoption occurs, (2) the semester or quarter immediately following birth or adoption if the birth or adoption occurs between semesters or quarters, or (3) the semester or quarter immediately following birth or adoption if the event occurs sufficiently late in the period that it does not substantially interfere with the faculty member’s duties during the period.

does not have meaning in the clinical setting. Because of the variation in duties of Medical Center clinical faculty and the ability of the clinical departments (and the patients) to accommodate flexibility, the availability and extent of a modification of duties or extension of paid leave for Medical Center clinical faculty must be stated clearly to be subject to providing for the reasonable needs of the department and school and must be approved in advance by the department chair and dean. It is important for faculty to discuss their plans and preferences with their department chair and dean as far in advance as possible. The optional period of half-pay leave or modified duties should be as consistent as possible with the period corresponding to a semester so as to be congruent with these possible benefits offered to non-clinical faculty.

3. Modified Duties for New Parents other than Birth Mother

Current University policy does not allow for modified duties for new parents other than the birth mother.

Findings: Currently, parents other than the birth mother have only the option of taking a personal leave without pay. This situation does not recognize the need for an adoptive parent, or for a parent other than the birth mother, to fulfill child-care responsibilities in the first critical months following a birth or adoption.

Recommendation 24: We recommend that University policy encourage a discussion between faculty who are new parents and their department chair concerning any desire on the part of the faculty member to have a modification of regularly assigned duties during the semester (or quarter) of the birth or adoption. Any modification of duties must accommodate the reasonable needs of the department and school and be approved well in advance of the start of the semester by the department chair and dean. It is important for faculty who wish to avail themselves of this opportunity to discuss their plans, and any proposal for desired modifications, with their department chair and dean as far in advance as possible. The schools will need to clarify the implementation of this recommendation in the case of faculty whose salaries are paid primarily through external funding.

For Medical Center clinical faculty the period of any modified duties should be as consistent as possible with the semester of modified duties available to non-clinical faculty.

4. Paid Part-Time for Faculty New Parents

Current University policy states, “Women faculty members who prefer to teach part-time before or after delivery may request such an arrangement from the dean or the director of their school. Requests for such part-time appointments, which should be made as far in advance of the beginning of the semester as possible, will depend upon the ability of the department to accommodate the arrangement without serious effects on the academic program. The part-time appointment will not be deducted from term contracts nor count towards the maximum number of years of appointment without tenure at the university.” (*University of Rochester Faculty Handbook*, p.61).

Findings: The current policy is limited only to women faculty giving birth; yet all new parents may feel the need to work part-time for a while to fulfill all their new duties. Further, the wording is not very friendly and some may interpret there being a penalty associated with taking this option.

Recommendation 25: We recommend that new parent faculty members be permitted to request an assignment of duties that would enable them to work part-time at a commensurate reduced salary for a period of up to a year following the birth or adoption of a child. Proposals to work part-time must be approved by the department chair and dean. It is important for faculty who wish to avail themselves of this opportunity to share their plans with their department chair and dean as far in advance as possible.

5. Unpaid personal leave for parents

Current University policy states, “Faculty, male or female, who wish time off for child care, may request personal leave. Such leaves are without pay, but University medical, dental, and group life insurance benefits will be maintained during the leave for up to one year.” (*University of Rochester Faculty Handbook*, p. 60).

Findings: The current policy in the *Faculty Handbook* does not reflect the Family Medical Leave Act, which was passed subsequent to the

current version of the Handbook. *University Personnel Policy #357, Leaves of Absences*, provides a right under FMLA to up to 12 weeks unpaid leave for the birth, adoption or placement of a child; to care for a spouse, child or parent who has a serious health condition; or when the faculty member is unable to work because of a serious health condition. Spouses who are both employed by the University are entitled to an aggregate total of 12 weeks for a birth, adoption or foster care. In addition, a University Leave of Absence is available for up to 12 months without pay for reasons such as education, dependent or elder care or community service, but must be approved in advance by the department chair, dean and director of Human Resources. Benefits continue during the paid (FLMA) portion of the leave. During the unpaid portion of a leave, many, but not all, benefits are continued although the faculty member will be expected to pay for the normal premium for her or his medical plan. The Leave of Absences Policy has many additional details and definitions.

Recommendation 26: We recommend that the unpaid personal leave policy in the *Faculty Handbook* be rewritten to make clear that a faculty member who wishes unpaid time off for child care purposes may take the leave, and is allowed 12 weeks under the Family Medical Leave Act. We also recommend that the discretionary University Leaves of Absence Policy be briefly explained, and that this include an explanation of the process for seeking approval for a University Leave of Absence of up to 12 months without pay as outlined in Personnel Policy #357. The *Faculty Handbook* should refer faculty for specifics to Personnel Policy #357.

Estimated Cost of Family Friendly Policies for Faculty, recommendations 21 – 26

Recommendations 22 and 23 will involve some costs, which we propose be paid by the benefit pool. The cost to the University for birth mothers choosing the full semester leave at half pay will depend upon the number of faculty who choose the option. The costs of family friendly options that depend upon school administrative approval are hard to predict. Such costs will depend on the number and the extent of benefits approved and the need for schools to pay others to do the work the relieved faculty members would otherwise accomplish. For a range of estimates for this recommendation, see Appendix 8.

D. Best Practices

1. Learning from Peer Institutions

Finding: The Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness examined best practices at peer institutions for the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty, and for the creation of a welcoming and inclusive environment. We used many of those best practices as models for the recommendations in this report. The Task Force recognizes, however, that there is much more to learn.

Recommendation 27: We recommend that the University faculty diversity officer continue to examine best practices for the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty, and for the creation of a welcoming and inclusive environment.

2. Policies and Programs for All Faculty

Finding: Formal, institutional support for overall faculty development at the University of Rochester is spotty, which compounds the sense of professional and social isolation often experienced by minority group members. Many best practices in the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty are not specific to women and underrepresented minorities, but rather are good practices for the recruitment and retention of **any** faculty. Many of those are included as recommendations in this report, especially those that, although helpful to all faculty, have somewhat greater significance to women and underrepresented minorities. We believe others, however, to be beyond the scope of this report, but worth mentioning here.

Recommendation 28: We recommend that the University faculty diversity officer work closely with academic leaders and administrators University-wide to coordinate on policies and programs that are beneficial to all faculty who wish to come to or remain at the University of Rochester. These policies and programs should include, but not be limited to those for **Faculty Development**.

a. Mentoring and General Issues of Faculty Development for Junior Faculty

Finding: Lack of mentoring and ongoing review and feedback are specific barriers to faculty advancement that are often addressed through structured formal programs. Funding for academic development (travel, research or programmatic start-up, etc.) is another obstacle for faculty retention, especially at the junior faculty level.

Recommendation 29: We recommend that the responsibility for faculty development remain at the school and department 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. The University diversity officer should routinely share new information about best practices in faculty development, especially those that increase the retention and promotion rates of a diverse faculty. Such information will cover topics ranging from good welcoming practices (e.g., congratulatory phone calls to new faculty hires from department chairs and deans), to how to assist junior faculty with preparation of promotion materials, to assistance in developing professional contacts and visibility, and the establishment of a successful mentorship program.

b. Faculty Development for Senior Faculty

Finding: Faculty development programs for mid-level and senior level faculty that focus on ways to help them develop as leaders will aide in the retention of these individuals. Their academic leadership is an asset to junior faculty.

Recommendation 30: We recommend 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 that include mentorship of junior faculty among the options for faculty promotion to encourage senior faculty to devote the time necessary to mentor.

c. Teaching Tools

Finding: Most faculty (outside of the Warner School and the School of Medicine and Dentistry) have little opportunity to receive formal training in teaching techniques.

Recommendation 31: We recommend that all six schools of the University evaluate the support given to faculty to improve teaching techniques. To the extent that seminars in teaching and instructional technology are applicable to the broader university community and are efficiently provided centrally, the Office of the Provost should evaluate the feasibility of doing so. Specific issues related to diversity and bias should be incorporated into such seminars.

Estimated Cost of the Best Practices Recommendations

There are minimal costs associated with the best practices recommendations.

VIII. Total Estimated Cost Over Five Years

Most of the Task Force recommendations can be implemented with minimal costs to the schools and the University. One significant cost is associated with the Special Opportunities Fund. The Task Force recommends that at least \$2,400,000 be provided to the Special Opportunities Fund over the next five years. If the current budget of \$200,000 were to continue over that five year period, total spending would be \$1,000,000; therefore, the additional cost of our proposal is \$1,400,000 over the five year period, for an average of an additional \$280,000 per year.

There will be some costs associated with the University faculty diversity officer and the central coordination function.

IX. Conclusion

The University of Rochester has a long and proud history that highlights our community's commitment to diversity; however, in one important respect, our faculty does not represent the ideals that we espouse. The Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness believes that the

University can do better in creating the diverse or welcoming community for faculty that must have been imagined by Susan B. Anthony and Frederick Douglass. Further, while the University of Rochester has struggled to make significant progress on this issue, our peers have developed programs and policies that have allowed them to move forward. To address this significant concern, we propose a series of changes to policies, programs, and practices in central University offices and functions, and across the six schools of the University. Consistent with our motto, *Meliora*, we respectfully submit the 31 recommendations described in this report.

Table 1
University of Rochester
Race and Ethnicity by Rank

2006								
Job Title	Am Ind	Asian	Black	Hisp	NS	White	Total	% URM
Professor	0	23	3	1	12	392	431	0.9%
Associate Professor	0	28	7	5	16	354	410	2.9%
Assistant Professor	0	42	9	5	127	264	447	3.1%
Total	0	93	19	11	155	1010	1288	2.3%

2000								
Job Title	Am Ind	Asian	Black	Hisp	NS	White	Total	% URM
Professor	0	13	2	1	0	365	381	0.8%
Associate Professor	0	13	6	2	0	327	348	2.3%
Assistant Professor	0	39	9	6	0	361	415	3.6%
Total	0	65	17	9	0	1053	1144	2.3%

Key	Am Ind	=American Indian
	Hisp	=Hispanic
	NS	=Non Specified
	URM	=Underrepresented Minority (American Indian, Black, and Hispanic)

Source: Office of Human resources: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) Data reports from September 1st.

Notes: In the text, this group is referred to as tenured and tenure-track faculty. There are a few tenured faculty members outside of these three job titles that are tenured but are not counted in this summary. Totals are smaller than actual faculty counts because faculty on leave do not appear on HRMS reports.

Table 2
University of Rochester
Gender by School and Rank

	2006			2000		
College - Arts & Science	Women	Total	% Women	Women	Total	% Women
Professor	19	129	14.7%	16	132	12.1%
Assoc Professor	18	49	36.7%	14	49	28.6%
Asst Professor	18	49	36.7%	16	53	30.2%
Total	55	227	24.2%	46	234	19.7%
College - Engineering						
Professor	1	30	3.3%	1	30	3.3%
Assoc Professor	3	12	25.0%		6	0.0%
Asst Professor	1	12	8.3%	2	7	28.6%
Total	5	54	9.3%	3	43	7.0%
Eastman						
Professor	12	42	28.6%	8	32	25.0%
Assoc Professor	6	31	19.4%	7	26	26.9%
Asst Professor	12	15	80.0%	5	15	33.3%
Total	30	88	34.1%	20	73	27.4%
Simon						
Professor		13	0.0%		15	0.0%
Assoc Professor	1	10	10.0%	2	10	20.0%
Asst Professor	2	8	25.0%	3	23	13.0%
Total	3	31	9.7%	5	48	10.4%
SMD						
Professor	30	203	14.8%	19	162	11.7%
Assoc Professor	86	298	28.9%	54	244	22.1%
Asst Professor	123	342	36.0%	111	302	36.8%
Total	239	843	28.4%	184	708	26.0%
SON						
Professor	8	8	100.0%	4	4	100%
Assoc Professor	4	4	100.0%	7	7	100%
Asst Professor	4	5	80.0%	6	6	100%
Total	16	17	94.1%	17	17	100%
Warner						
Professor	4	6	66.7%	1	6	16.7%
Assoc Professor	3	6	50.0%	3	6	50.0%
Asst Professor	11	16	68.8%	6	9	66.7%
Total	18	28	64.3%	10	21	47.6%
Professor Total	74	431	17.2%	49	381	12.9%
Assoc Professor Total	121	410	29.5%	87	348	25.0%
Asst Professor Total	171	447	38.3%	149	415	35.9%
6 School Total	366	1288	28.4%	285	1144	24.9%

Source: Office of Human resources: Human Resources Management System (HRMS) data reports from September 1st.

Notes: In the text, this group is referred to as tenured and tenure-track faculty. There are a few tenured faculty members outside of these three job titles that are tenured but are not counted in this summary. Totals by school are smaller than actual faculty counts because faculty on leave do not appear on HRMS reports.

Table 3
University of Rochester Compared to our COFHE peers: 2004-2005
excluding Medical Center Faculty

	% URM	% Women
Arts & Sciences		
University of Rochester	3.5%	25%
COFHE University Median	6.1%	30%
Humanities		
University of Rochester	4.8%	36%
COFHE University Median	9.1%	43%
Social Science		
University of Rochester	8.2%	26%
COFHE University Median	8.3%	29%
Physical and Life Sciences		
University of Rochester	0.0%	17%
COFHE University Median	2.0%	17%
Engineering		
University of Rochester	3.4%	8%
COFHE University Median	4.5%	11%
Professional		
University of Rochester	4.0%	32%
COFHE University Median	6.5%	32%
All Disciplines		
University of Rochester	3.7%	26%
COFHE University Median	6.2%	29%

Note: URM is Underrepresented Minorities including Black, Hispanic, and American Indian.

Source: COFHE Institutional Profiles Project: Faculty Counts Academic Year 2004-2005.

Table 4
AAU Peer Comparison

**Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty including Medical Center Faculty
by Ethnicity and Gender: Fall 2005**

	% URM	%Women
University of Rochester	2.5%	27.1%
AAU Private Universities Median	6.1%	27.5%

Source: US Department of Education: National Center for Education
Statistics: IPEDS Peer Analysis System Full-and Part-time staff by
Primary Occupational Activity Fall 2005.

APPENDIX 1

Charge of the Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness

The Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusiveness will make recommendations to the President on or before October 1, 2006 that will outline a program to address faculty diversity and inclusiveness. Recommendations will include those that are expected to expand the diversity of the faculty applicant pool; assist in the successful recruitment of a diverse faculty; improve the professional environment for minority, female, and other faculty (as defined by the Task Force); and improve the retention and promotion rates of faculty members who contribute to the diversity of the University community. The recommendations will define University and divisional structures and personnel that will be needed to support the recommended diversity and inclusiveness program, identify measures that will be used to evaluate the success of the program, and estimate the cost of the program over a five-year period. All recommendations will be reviewed by legal counsel before completion of the project.

- In preparing its recommendations, the Task Force is expected to:
1. define diversity;
 2. review recent University of Rochester applicant, hiring, promotion, and retention data;
 3. review existing programs that have been implemented in schools and departments to address issues related to faculty diversity, seeking to understand those that have been successful in achieving their goals;
 4. with respect to minority, female, and other faculty members:
 - a. review the potential barriers to University of Rochester employment (e.g., the extent to which there is sufficient assistance in obtaining spouse or partner employment);
 - b. review the climate for traditionally excluded groups at the University;
 - c. review the faculty diversity and inclusiveness programs that have been implemented at peer institutions;
 - d. address how each school and program should report to the President with respect to faculty diversity in hiring and retention.

APPENDIX 2

Summary of the 2005 Report on Eligibility to Vote in Elections for Faculty Senate and University Committee on Tenure and Privileges

The Faculty Senate Committee on Elections report of February 22, 2005, defines those members of the faculties of each school of the University of Rochester that are eligible to vote for and serve in the Faculty Senate. This definition is referred to in the Task Force report as “Faculty as defined by the Faculty Senate.”

Although all six schools in the University have faculty with the titles professor, associate professor, and assistant professor, all of whom qualify to vote in Faculty Senate elections, the schools each make use of a different set of additional titles as well. The Elections Committee did not want to exclude any faculty with those additional titles if it was determined that they had a say in making faculty hiring or promotion and tenure decisions in their schools. In order to determine who among those with the other faculty titles were involved in hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions, and therefore should be considered voting members of the faculty for the purpose of Faculty Senate elections, members of the Elections Committee interviewed the dean or associate dean for academic affairs in each school.

As a result of those interviews, the Elections Committee was able to assemble a list of faculty titles, by school, that would be considered eligible for Faculty Senate elections. That list of faculty titles is available upon request.

APPENDIX 3

School	Reporting Structure	Diversity Officer Title	Year Position Created
Brandeis		None	
Brown	Provost: Office of Institutional Diversity	Associate Provost and Director of Institutional Diversity	2003
CalTech		None	
Carnegie Mellon		None	2000
Case Western Reserve	HR: Equal Opportunity and Diversity Office	Faculty Diversity Officer	
Columbia	Provost	Office of the Vice Provost for Diversity Initiatives	2004
Cornell	Provost	Office of Vice Provost for Diversity and Faculty Development	
Duke	Provost	Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Faculty Development	2005
Emory		None	
Harvard	Provost	Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity	2005
Johns Hopkins		None	
MIT	Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity and Diversity Programs Office	Vice President for Human Resources and Equal Opportunity Officer & Council on Faculty Diversity	
NYU		None	
Northwestern		None	
Princeton		None	
Rice		None	
Syracuse		None	
Stanford	Provost	Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development	
Tulane	President	Vice President for Institutional Equity and Assistant to the President for Diversity Initiatives	2004
University of Chicago		None	
University of Pennsylvania	Provost	Assistant Provost for Gender and Minority Equity Issues	New
USC	Provost	Special Advisor to the Provost	
Vanderbilt		None	
Washington Univ	Chancellor	Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Diversity Initiatives	2005
Yale	Provost	Deputy Provost for Science Technology and Faculty Development will convene a Yale Committee on Faculty Diversity	

APPENDIX 4

Assessment

The Task Force recommends that the University faculty diversity officer oversee the regular assessment of the faculty diversity program along several dimensions.

1. Overall Program Implementation

How many of the Task Force recommendations have been successfully implemented?

2. Data

Data assessment should include, but not be limited to:

- Overall faculty profile by race and sex, by discipline, by rank
- Number of applicants for faculty positions by race and sex, by discipline
- Number of faculty jobs offered by race and sex, by discipline
- Number of faculty hires by race and sex, by discipline
- Number of faculty promotions by race and sex, by discipline
- Number of faculty departures by race and sex, by discipline
- Number of faculty exit interviews

3. Visibility of the University Commitment to Diversity

Web presence:

- Is there a direct link to a faculty diversity web page from the University's home page?
- Is the web page informative, up-to-date, easy to navigate?

Speakers, discussion groups, social events:

- How many events related to the celebration of diversity are on the University's campuses?
- How many educational forums on the topic of faculty diversity are offered to the University community?
- Are events well attended?

4. Environment

Climate study:

APPENDIX 4

Have we done a faculty climate study?
What have we learned?

Awareness and satisfaction:

To what extent are people aware of faculty diversity programming at the University?

What is the satisfaction rate of the University's faculty diversity program?

5. Search Committee Support

Were informational packages on increasing the diversity of search pools created? If so, how many were distributed?

How many search committees were trained or advised?

6. Special Opportunities Fund

How many new hires have been aided by the Fund (by race and sex, by discipline)?

How many retentions have been aided by the Fund (by race and sex, by discipline)?

7. Family friendly policies

How many tenure clock extensions have been granted for new parents?

How many new birth mothers have accepted modified duties, time off at half-pay, or extended part-time duties at modified pay for a period beyond the guaranteed paid time off?

How many other new parents have opted for a modified duty schedule?

How many parents have opted for unpaid time off for child care purposes?

8. New Faculty Programs and Faculty Development

New faculty orientation:

APPENDIX 4

What sort of changes have been implemented in new faculty orientation programs?

What information are new faculty receiving within a month of their arrival?

With what academic and administration leaders have new faculty met?

Networking:

How many networks or affinity groups have been created for minorities and women?

How many new members do the networks and affinity groups have?

Mentoring:

How many junior faculty have mentors?

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

FACULTY DIVERSITY SURVEY

You have been randomly selected as part of a faculty survey pilot group. Please take a few minutes to fill out this questionnaire. Your responses will be of great value to us in our work.

Click this link to find out more about who we are, why we need this information, and what we will do with it: courses.ats.rochester.edu/provost/diversity/letter.html

If you do not wish to complete this questionnaire, please check the box and give your reasons below, then scroll to the bottom and click “Continue” to submit your answers.

I do not wish to participate.

Reasons?

Race/ Ethnicity by Federal Guidelines (please choose only one)

- White
- Black
- Hispanic
- Asian
- American Indian
- Pacific Islander
- Other
- Decline to State

Race/ Ethnicity by Census Bureau Guidelines

Since 2000, the Census Bureau has considered race and Hispanic origin to be two

APPENDIX 5

separate and distinct categories. Hispanics may be of any race. The terms “Hispanic” and “Latino” are used interchangeably. In the last census, questions concerning race and Hispanic origin were asked of every individual living in the United States.

Why are there two Race/Ethnicity reporting guidelines?

Current Federal forms categorize racial and ethnic data using the terms White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, and Pacific Islander. Historically, the University of Rochester’s data have been compiled using these federal guidelines.

However, the US Census Bureau uses a broader set of terms to describe ethnic and racial background. In the future, it is likely that Census Bureau guidelines will replace the Federal guidelines currently used.

In order to fully quantify our current and future demographics, it will be helpful at this time to collect data in both formats.

Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?

Yes No

If "YES" to the above question, click the appropriate box below. If “NO,” please skip to the next question.

Puerto Rican

Mexican, Mexican Am, Chicano

Cuban

Other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino (Please fill in)

What race do you consider yourself to be? (Please choose all that apply)

(For more on racial categories as defined by the Census Bureau, go to courses.ats.rochester.edu/provost/diversity/letter.html.)

White

Black, African American, or Negro

American Indian and Alaskan Native (Please type name of enrolled or principle tribe)

Indian (Asian)

Chinese

Filipino

Japanese

APPENDIX 5

- Native Hawaiian
- Korean
- Guamanian or Chamorro
- Vietnamese
- Samoan
- Other Asian (specify race)
- Other Pacific Islander (specify race)
- Other (specify race)
- Decline to State

NOTE: You may update or correct your personal information with UR Human Resources by completing the Personal Data Form or the Self Identification Data Form available under the UR Documentation link in the HRMS system, or by calling ASK-URHR (275-8747).

Continue

This survey was designed using Perseus SurveySolutions software, and is being conducted under the auspices of the Office of the Provost, University of Rochester.

APPENDIX 6

University of Rochester Affirmative Action Form Appointment to a position as FACULTY or other Instructional Personnel	This section for use by Provost's Office only. Tracking # ____ x ____
--	---

Shaded areas are required. Please use one form per appointment. * Appropriate codes are listed on page one of this form (above).

Position	College/School	Dept	Decision date
Position code *	Div-Dept #	Special Efforts *	
(use relevant Position Codes only)		___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___8 ___9 Other (7):	
Tenure status [T/N/E] *	Time status *	(check all that apply)	
(Reminder: T=appointed <u>with</u> Tenured / N=Non-tenure track / E=Eligible but <u>not</u> tenured yet)			

Successful Applicant (Appointee):

Empl ID	Full Name (Last, First, M.I.)	Sex	Referral	Race/ Ethnicity	Application Date	Result	Salary Offered	Comments (Optional)
preferred (or SSN)					____/____/____	60	____	

Appointee Military Status - check where applicable		
___ No Service	___ Disabled Veteran	___ Active Reserve
	___ Vietnam Era Veteran	___ Inactive Reserve
	___ Other Veteran - examples:	___ Retired
(but not limited to) Bosnia, Iraq, Persian Gulf, Somalia		
Discharge Date: ____/____/____		

Optional: Disability - check all that apply	
___ 1. Ambulatory or Orthopaedic	___ 4. Learning
___ 2. Coordination	___ 5. Psychological
___ 3. Hearing	___ 6. Speech
	___ 7. Sight
___ 8. Other (qualify): _____	

Other Applicants:	Name	Sex	Refer- ral	Race/ Ethnicity	Application Date	Result (60)	Reason	Comments (Optional)
			*	*		*	*	
	_____		_____		____/____/____			_____
	_____		_____		____/____/____			_____
	_____		_____		____/____/____			_____
	_____		_____		____/____/____			_____

If needed, attach list of all **Other Applicants** including all codes for Result and Reason.

Telephone _____

Name _____

Department _____

of person completing this form.

For assistance with this form, please contact Vini Falciano at x5-2806.

APPENDIX 7

	On-site Day Care	On-site Senior Parent Care/Elder Parent Care	Tenure Clock Extension	Teaching Load
University of Rochester	Near-campus facility open to employees. Employee rates are slightly lower than general public.	No general information available; EAP would offer consultation and make appropriate referral.	If requested, a personal leave that lasts a semester or more (due to family illness, child care, or other urgent matters that would preclude the performance of the person's responsibilities) stops the tenure clock. Part-time personal leaves extend tenure clock proportionally to reduction in effort.	A woman may request a part-time appointment, before or after delivery, which will not count towards the maximum length of employment without tenure. A woman may request a reduced teaching load for the semester following childbirth by transferring classes to the previous or following semester.
Brown University	Affiliated with 2 day-care centers. For infants/toddlers, there is a center with 20 spots (for both Brown employees and general public) located within 2 miles. For ages 3 through kindergarten, a center is located less than 1 mile away. 60% of spots are for Brown employees or students. No reduced rates.	No general information available; EAP would offer consultation and make appropriate referral.	May request a 1-year extension (or extension concurrent with leave) for childbirth, parental leave, adoption of a child, or caring for a sick child or family member.	Primary caregiver of newborn or newly adopted child may receive 1 semester of teaching relief. Must still continue research and other administrative responsibilities.
Dartmouth College	Campus and Medical Center facilities exclusively for benefit-eligible employees at Dartmouth and its affiliates.	Offers a variety of information on resources for elder relatives, including retirement communities, senior centers, home care services, and hospice.	May request an extension of up to 1 year for each dependent child. May also request an extension if there are any health issues or personal relations within a family that impose any special responsibilities.	Teaching load is cut in half for 2 of the 3 terms for tenure-track faculty (1 term taken off for maternity leave).
Duke University	On-campus facility exclusively for faculty, staff, and students, as well as information on outside programs and nannies. Other centers in the area give priority to Duke employees and students.	Provide information and consultations to faculty and staff seeking help with elder care.	Any life events that are reasonably expected to delay the research process - maximum of 2 extensions (each of which can be for 1 or 2 semesters). Birth/adoption - no limit on the amount of extensions.	No information found outside of maternity/personal leaves.
Emory University	Four centers available, ranging from on-site to 6 miles away. Three centers are for employees or give priority to employees. One center specializes in caring for autistic children.	Offers free, confidential consultation services to assist with finding resources for elder care.	May request a delay not to exceed 2 years due to birth, adoption, or responsibility for an ill family member.	Primary caregiver of a child under 5 (or a child 5 or older with special needs) may request 1 term off, or a half-load for 2 terms, with no loss of pay. Responsible for research and administrative duties. Not available to spouse of primary caregiver.

APPENDIX 7

	On-site Day Care	On-site Senior Parent Care/Elder Parent Care	Tenure Clock Extension	Teaching Load
Northwestern University	No on-site day care - referral service provides at least 3 providers with vacancies, based on selection criteria specified by the faculty member.	Provide information to faculty and staff seeking help with elder care.	May request an extension of up to 1 year for birth or adoption. May also request an extension due to personal or family emergencies.	No information found outside of maternity/personal leaves.
Stanford University	Six on-site centers that can serve 650 children ages 8 weeks through second grade (after-school program). Depending on specific center, it may be exclusively for Stanford affiliates or may give priority and/or reduced rates to Stanford affiliates. http://worklife.stanford.edu/children_prog.html	Offers support group and resources for finding care for incapacitated parents, spouse, or other relatives, whether nearby or in another part of country.	No extension for maternity leave. Childcare leave (available to either parent, for up to 1 year) automatically stops clock for duration of leave. New parents, through birth or adoption (if the child is younger than 6), may request a 1-year extension (in addition to childcare leave extension) if they have substantial and sustainable childcare responsibilities.	New parents, through birth or adoption (if the child is younger than 6), may request a reduced teaching load in the quarter of birth/adoption or immediately following. Responsible for all research and administrative duties. Clinical faculty may request to be excused from clinical responsibilities and classroom teaching for 90 days following arrival of child (for birth mother, 90 days after end of maternity leave). Responsible for all research and administrative duties, as well as classroom teaching (if any).
University of Pennsylvania	On-campus center for children ages 3 months through 5 years. Open to public but priority and discounted rates are given to employees and students.	Offers information on elder care services. <i>Specific resources can only be viewed by U. Penn employees.</i>	May request an extension of 1 semester if any of the following occurs: child born, adopted (under 2 years old), or placed into foster care (under 2 years old), or faculty member becomes primary caregiver for seriously ill parent, spouse, child, or domestic partner. If policy applies to both parents, both are eligible for an extension. May request an extension of 1 year for every 2 years working at 50% (see "Teaching Load"; the same policy extends to serious illness and injury). Total extensions not to exceed 3 years.	May request a reduction in duties of 10%-50%, with commensurate reduction in salary and salary-based benefits.

APPENDIX 7

	On-site Day Care	On-site Senior Parent Care/Elder Parent Care	Tenure Clock Extension	Teaching Load
Vanderbilt University	Child care centers near the Medical Center and University campus exclusively for employees.	Offers information on adult day care programs, assisted and independent living facilities, respite care programs, and elderly care facilities.	Faculty members who give birth automatically receive a 1-semester extension, with a maximum of 2 granted. 1-semester extensions may also be requested for personal illness, child care, or illness/death of an immediate family member. Total time granted may not exceed 2 years.	No information found outside of maternity/personal leaves.
Washington University	One facility on campus and two facilities within walking distance. Priority given to employees and staff. Payroll deduction (pre-tax) available. No reduced rates.	Offers consultation and an individualized list of resources.	May request an extension to make up for time spent on Parental Leave (see "Maternity Leave" or "Paternity Leave"). Extensions are rounded up to equal whole years.	No information found outside of maternity/personal leaves.
Yale University	Provide child care referrals for employees; no information about on-site child care.	In any 2-year period, may take up to 16 weeks in first year and 12 in the second year to care for ill parent, without pay. Time available for leave is reduced by any time taken in that 2-year period for Child Rearing Leave, maternity, or short-term disability. Offers a variety of information on resources for elder relatives, including retirement communities, senior centers, home care services, and hospice. Offers information on support groups.	Full-time faculty with an appointment of more than 3 years who take at least six weeks off for bearing or adopting a child, or caring for an ill spouse, parent, or child may request a six-month extension.	No information found outside of maternity/personal leaves.

APPENDIX 7

	Benefits	Educational Information for Special Needs Families	Maternity Leave	Paternity Leave
University of Rochester	<p>Paid leave: no change to benefits. Unpaid leave: Health, dental, and life insurance continue, with employee billed quarterly for their share of the premiums, if any.</p>	<p>No general information available; EAP would offer consultation and make appropriate referral.</p>	<p>Eight weeks of full pay; longer leave granted if medically necessary, up to maximum entitlement according to years of University service. Alternatively, may elect to take off for 1 full semester (6 months) at 1/3 pay. May request an unpaid leave of up to 1 year for child care purposes.</p>	<p>May request an unpaid leave of up to 1 year for child care purposes.</p>
Brown University	<p>Paid leave: no change to benefits. Unpaid leave: faculty must pay Brown's portions of the premiums in addition to their own.</p>	<p>No general information available; Faculty and Staff Assistance Program would offer consultation and make appropriate referral.</p>	<p>Six weeks of full pay; longer leave granted if medically necessary, up to 6 months. 1 semester of unpaid leave in any 2-year period for care of a newborn child. May arrange for an alternative work schedule for one semester with pay, by moving teaching obligations to previous or following semesters.</p>	<p>1 semester of unpaid leave in any 2-year period for care of a newborn child. May arrange for an alternative work schedule for one semester with pay, by moving teaching obligations to previous or following semesters.</p>
Dartmouth College	<p>Paid leave: no change to benefits. Unpaid leave: faculty must pay their share of the premiums for health insurance.</p>	<p>Provides information on Department of Education in both Vermont and New Hampshire.</p>	<p>Time off with full compensation for 1 of 3 terms in a year. For tenure-track faculty, teaching load for the year is cut in half and remaining courses are spread over the 2 terms worked.</p>	<p>No information found besides FMLA.</p>
Duke University	<p>Paid leave: no change to benefits. Unpaid leave: faculty must pay their share of the premiums for health insurance.</p>	<p>Provides information on childcare providers who can work with children with special needs. Offers free consultations and referrals to childcare programs, based on a family's specific needs.</p>	<p>Regular faculty: 1 semester off (up to 3 months for School of Medicine or School of Nursing) with full pay for the child's primary caregiver. Non-regular faculty: 3 weeks off with full pay for the child's primary caregiver.</p>	<p>Regular faculty: 1 semester off (up to 3 months for School of Medicine or School of Nursing) with full pay for the child's primary caregiver. Non-regular faculty: 3 weeks off with full pay for the child's primary caregiver.</p>
Emory University	<p>Paid leave: no change to benefits. Unpaid leave: faculty must pay their share of the premiums for health, dental, and life insurance.</p>	<p>Offers counseling/referrals to community resources. One of Emory's childcare centers specializes in autistic children.</p>	<p>Full pay for period of medically certified disability, up to six months. See additional provisions under "Teaching Load".</p>	<p>See "Teaching Load".</p>
Northwestern University	<p>Determined by Northwestern when leave is authorized.</p>	<p>Offers several sources of information for children with special needs.</p>	<p>Six weeks of full pay; longer leave granted if medically necessary, up to 6 months for tenured faculty or untenured faculty with 10 or more years of service or 3 months for non-tenured faculty (with 3 additional months at 60% pay). May request an unpaid leave of absence for child rearing.</p>	<p>May request an unpaid leave of absence for child rearing.</p>

APPENDIX 7

	Benefits	Educational Information for Special Needs Families	Maternity Leave	Paternity Leave
Stanford University	For the first 12 weeks of a leave, faculty must pay their own contributions for medical and dental. After 12 weeks, faculty must pay Stanford's portions of the premiums in addition to their own.	Stanford's WorkLife office offers library materials and seminars for families with children with special needs.	Full pay for period of medically certified disability, up to four months. May request an unpaid leave of up to 1 year for child care purposes, in addition to reduced teaching or clinical duties.	May request an unpaid leave of up to 1 year for child care purposes.
University of Pennsylvania	See "Teaching Load" – any reduction in duties reduces salary-based benefits.	Offers information for children with special needs. <i>Specific resources can only be viewed by U. Penn employees.</i>	Relieved of teaching duties for semester of childbirth, if medical condition would interrupt teaching for 3 or more weeks. No loss of pay or benefits. Responsible for performing research and administrative duties.	See "Teaching Load".
Vanderbilt University	Paid leave: no change to benefits. Unpaid leave, including 30 days allotted by Tennessee Maternity Leave Act (TMLA): faculty must pay their share of the premiums for health and dental insurance.	Offers several sources of information for children with special needs: http://www.vanderbilt.edu/VirtualSchool/archive/speclink.htm .	After 1 year of employment, full pay for period of medically certified disability, up to four months. May take 30 days beyond 12-week FMLA entitlement, per TMLA. Primary caregiver may request parental leave for 1 semester, at full pay, for a newborn or newly adopted child under 5. Only available to one parent. May be used up to 3 times.	Primary caregiver may request parental leave for 1 semester, at full pay. Only available to one parent. May be used up to 3 times.
Washington University	Paid leave (campus faculty): no change to benefits. Unpaid leave under FMLA (medical faculty): faculty must pay their share of the premiums for health insurance.	No general information available; EAP would offer consultation and make appropriate referral.	Campus tenured or tenure-track faculty: In addition to any leave granted for medical incapacitation, 1 semester of relief from teaching, research, and administrative duties, without loss of pay or benefits, for the primary caregiver of a newborn or newly adopted child. Only available to one parent. Medical faculty: provided benefits under FMLA.	Campus tenured or tenure-track faculty: 1 semester of relief from teaching, research, and administrative duties, without loss of pay or benefits, for the primary caregiver of a newborn or newly adopted child. Only available to one parent. Medical faculty: provided benefits under FMLA.
Yale University	Paid leave: no change to benefits. Unpaid leave: Yale continues health, dental, and life insurance; faculty must make arrangements to pay their share of the premiums.	Offers information on special needs educational services in Connecticut; Yale Center for Children with Special Health Care Needs is a network of professionals who work with families with special needs.	Relieved of teaching duties for semester of or following childbirth, with no loss of pay. Responsible for performing research and administrative duties while medically able.	May request an unpaid leave of up to 1 semester within the first year after the birth.

APPENDIX 7

	Adoption	Trailing Spouse
University of Rochester	May request an unpaid leave of up to 1 year for child care purposes.	Participates in the Upstate New York Higher Education Recruitment Consortium, a group of regional colleges and universities which share open job opportunities.
Brown University	1 semester of unpaid leave in any 2-year period for care of a newly adopted child under 16 years old. May arrange for an alternative work schedule for one semester with pay, by moving teaching obligations to previous or following semesters.	No documented policies/practices found. No response to inquiry to HR director; representative who answered phone believes assistance would be provided at the departmental level.
Dartmouth College	Full-time employees are eligible for reimbursement up to \$5,000 for expenses related to the adoption of a child. No benefits regarding leave found in Dartmouth handbook.	Human Resources and Dean's Office provide assistance to spouses seeking staff or faculty positions.
Duke University	Regular faculty: One semester off (up to 3 months for School of Medicine or School of Nursing) with full pay for the child's primary caregiver, if the child adopted is under 6 years old. Non-regular faculty: 3 weeks off with full pay for the child's primary caregiver, if the child adopted is under 6 years old.	No formal policy or assistance program; aid is provided on a case-by-case basis.
Emory University	See "Teaching Load".	Assistance usually happens at the departmental level, and seems to vary across departments. Some divisions attempt to make joint offers if both members of a couple are academic. Offers assistance with finding non-academic positions within the Atlanta area.
Northwestern University	May request an unpaid leave of absence for child rearing.	Employment assistance and resources offered to spouses.
Stanford University	Employees working half-time or more are eligible for reimbursement up to \$10,000 for expenses related to the adoption of a child. May request an unpaid leave of up to 1 year for child care purposes.	No documented policies/practices found. No response to inquiry to Human Resources Department.
University of Pennsylvania	No benefits found, beyond reduction in duties (see "Teaching Load").	Partners with Employee Transfer Corporation, an organization that provides assistance with relocation. ETC assists spouses with finding employment by assessing their skills and interests and performing a proactive job search.
Vanderbilt University	Primary caregiver may request parental leave for 1 semester, at full pay, for a newly adopted child under 5. Only available to one parent.	Has an Office of Family Recruitment and Relocation Resources. Among other services, offers assistance to spouses looking for employment, by providing information on job openings in the area, networking, and recommending search firms and personnel agencies.
Washington University	Campus tenured or tenure-track faculty: 1 semester of relief from teaching, research, and administrative duties, without loss of pay or benefits, for the primary caregiver of a newly adopted child. Only available to one parent. Medical faculty: provided benefits under FMLA.	No documented policies/practices found. No response to inquiry to Human Resources Department.
Yale University	New parents may request an unpaid leave of up to 1 semester within the first year after the adoption.	No documented policies/practices found. No response to inquiry to Human Resources Department.

APPENDIX 8

Semester Leave at One-Half Pay Cost Estimate

Over the last five years, eight new mothers took advantage of the benefit that allows for a semester leave at one-third pay.

We can estimate the number of faculty who would be eligible for the full semester leave at one-half pay. In 2005, the only year for which we have data on faculty who took an eight-week paid maternity leave, 30 women would have been eligible for one-half pay.

Our experience of eight semester leaves at one-third pay over the most recent five-year period (or about two such leaves each year) provides a lower bound estimate for the number who would take the semester leave at one-half pay. Last year, the average salary of the women on eight-week paid maternity leave was \$91,000. One-semester salary plus benefits is about \$56,300. The marginal cost of the proposed policy change from one-third pay to one-half pay for two faculty members is the difference between one-third of \$56,300 and one-half of \$56,300 times two, or an additional \$18,800 cost to the benefit pool.

As an upper bound estimate, we can assume that rather than two faculty members of the 30 eligible opting for the semester leave, the increase to one-half pay encourages ten faculty members per year to take advantage of the benefit. In this case, the total cost to the benefit pool is the change in the cost of the two original faculty members when pay was increased from one-third to one-half (\$18,800) plus the full one-half pay (plus benefits) for the additional eight faculty members. Again, assuming an average semester salary (plus benefits) of 56,300, eight additional faculty members at one-half pay for one semester would add another \$225,000 to the annual benefit pool expenditures for a total upper bound cost of approximately \$244,000.

However, this is offset by the decline in payroll costs to the schools. That is, if ten new mothers take the semester off at one-half pay, the schools will decrease total payroll by the equivalent of a full semester pay for each of those faculty members (in this example, a decline in payroll costs for the eight additional women, or \$450,400). Costs will be incurred by the schools if it is necessary to temporarily hire additional people to perform the duties that would have been handled by the faculty on leave (e.g., course instruction). It is anticipated, however, that such individuals would be hired at a cost that is considerably lower than the faculty salaries of those who are on leave.