Quality of Life Survey Follow-Up Study of Underrepresented Minority Faculty at Stanford University

Report #1
Recognition and Collegiality

Stanford University
Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life
May 2013

Quality of Life Survey
Follow-Up Study
of Underrepresented Minority Faculty
at Stanford University

Report #1

Recognition and Collegiality

Stanford University
Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life
May 2013

Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life, Committee on Underrepresented Minority Faculty Interview Study:

Shelley Correll
Chair, Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life; Professor of Sociology

anthony lising antonio
Associate Professor of Education

Hannah Valantine
Senior Associate Dean for Diversity and Leadership in the School of Medicine;
Professor of Medicine

Jacyn Lewis
Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity;
Associate Dean in the School of Humanities and Sciences (through June 2012)

With Support from:

Karen S. Cook
Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity;
Ray Lyman Wilbur Professor of Sociology

Report Authors:

Corrie Potter
Manager of Assessment and Program Evaluation, Institutional Research & Decision Support

Shelley Correll
Chair, Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life; Professor of Sociology

Yan Li
Research Analyst, Office for Faculty Development and Diversity

Acknowledgements

The Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life is deeply grateful for the time and candor of the faculty members who participated in the interviews. The panel would also like to thank the consultants who conducted interviews. Their flexibility and engagement made the project possible, and their feedback was very valuable.

Lindsay Oishi and Beth Red Bird provided research assistance.

Background and Overview of URM Faculty Interview Study

BACKGROUND

In 2001, following the MIT report on gender bias in science and engineering, Stanford University joined eight other leading universities in their initiatives on studying gender equity and sharing strategies for change. As part of that initiative, President John Hennessy and Provost John Etchemendy created the Provost's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women Faculty (PACSWF), which was renamed the Panel on Gender Equity and Quality of Life in 2004, and the Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life in 2008. Over the past decade or so, the panel has conducted studies on faculty equity and satisfaction, recruitment, and retention, including the university's first Faculty Quality of Life Survey in 2003 and a focused analysis on race/ethnicity using data from that survey.[1]

In 2007, President Hennessy and Provost Etchemendy reaffirmed the university's commitment to diversity, stating: "Stanford University seeks and promotes an academic environment for each faculty member that is collegial, intellectually stimulating and respectful of his or her contributions and accomplishments." [2]

In 2008, the Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life (hereafter referred to as the panel) designed and administered Stanford's second Faculty Quality of Life Survey, to update its assessment of climate and equity issues. The survey found that the overall satisfaction with being a faculty member at Stanford was quite high, with 79% of the faculty reporting being satisfied with their jobs. The overall satisfaction levels of Stanford faculty were similar to, and in some cases higher than, our peers.[3] In addition, the overall satisfaction levels for Stanford faculty did not differ significantly by gender or race/ethnicity.

However, there were a number of ways in which faculty members experienced the Stanford academic environment differently. Specifically, the survey found that underrepresented minority (URM) faculty, compared to non-minority faculty, on average, perceived their colleagues and academic units to be significantly less supportive, reported a lower sense of social inclusion, and felt they had to work harder to be perceived as legitimate scholars. These differences were small, but they are important because perceived supportiveness of a faculty member's unit and colleagues were found, in the survey, to be a key predictor of satisfaction and intention to remain at Stanford.

The panel formed a Committee on Underrepresented Minority Faculty to design and conduct a follow-up interview study to further investigate URM faculty experiences at Stanford. The committee held two meetings with twenty faculty members at Stanford regarded as "thought leaders" within their respective URM communities to discuss ways to increase participation. These leaders concluded that to motivate participation, faculty would need to be convinced that university leaders would commit to effective follow-up.

In response to these leaders' suggestions, the Provost expressed his commitment to responding to the findings that would emerge from the interviews, and gladly agreed to invite faculty members to participate in the interview study. The panel obtained IRB approval in April 2010. Invitations to participate were sent by the Provost to the study population in various schools successively between August 2010 and March 2011. Interviews with a total of 52 URM faculty members (see section on sample characteristics) were conducted through April 2011.

1 Available as PACSWF Report on https://facultydevelopment.stanford.edu/data-reports/reports-publications.

2 Available at https://facultydevelopment.stanford.edu/about-us/presidents-statement-diversity.

3 *The Report on the Quality of Life of Stanford Faculty* was released in 2010, and is available at https://facultydevelopment.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/documents/fqol-report-jan2010.pdf.

The panel will release the findings in two reports in spring and fall quarters, 2013. In each report, the panel has taken steps to offer initial recommendations to the provost about how the university can improve the academic environment for URM faculty. Following each release, the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity and the panel will hold sessions with key stakeholders and decision-makers to discuss the findings and recommendations in each report. By releasing the reports sequentially, the panel hopes to stimulate ongoing institutional engagement leading to meaningful organizational change.

STUDY OVERVIEW

Research questions

As a follow-up to the Quality of Life Survey in 2008, the goal of the interview study with URM faculty was to explore in greater depth individual experiences leading to the observed differences between URM and non-minority faculty, and thus shed light on the underlying issues that the statistical findings did not capture. Specifically, focusing on areas of the small, but significant, differences between URM and other faculty in the Quality of Life Survey findings, the interview study aimed to answer the following research questions:

1.. How do Stanford URM faculty experience relationships with colleagues, collegiality, and/or isolation?

2. How do Stanford URM faculty experience university and unit practices, such as mentoring, voice in decision-making, and support from university and unit leadership, etc., that may contribute to a sense of recognition and collegiality, as well as general satisfaction?

3. How do racial/ethnic identities affect Stanford URM faculty experiences in the areas mentioned above? How do these experiences vary by gender and rank?

The interview method

Quantitative findings from the Quality of Life Survey provided general information about attitudes and perceptions. For the follow-up study of URM faculty, the panel chose to use in-depth interviews to present a richer portrait of URM faculty experiences in their own voices, and to reflect the nuances and complexities of faculty members' work-lives and relationships. The interview protocol was semi-structured, with the interview items focused on the research questions presented above.

In-depth interviews provide richer information about individual-level experiences not easily captured by aggregate numbers, however, there are also a few limitations of this method that guide our interpretation of the findings:

- Even though the study sought to recruit participants from each URM category and from each rank and gender, representativeness was not a goal — that is, we do not make generalizations about how widely some of the particular individual experiences described by participants are shared by faculty beyond the study sample. We do, however, ground our interpretations of the general patterns that emerged from the interview data in the larger context of prior survey findings as well as existing social science research on racial/ethnic identity processes in the workplace.
- As a follow-up to the prior Quality of Life survey findings, this qualitative study was designed to focus on URM faculty only, and the goal was neither to establish causal relationships between racial/ethnic background and quality of life, nor to produce comparative data between URM and non-minority faculty. However, since all faculty are members of the same campus community and the larger academic profession, we recognize that many of the issues revealed in this report are not unique to URM faculty; indeed, we expect that many Asian and white faculty will find much that is familiar in the accounts that follow.

- The present study is grounded in the previous Quality of Life survey findings that revealed systematic and significant differences in perceived levels of colleague and unit support between URM faculty and their non-minority peers at Stanford. Further, this report presents descriptions of the ways in which general difficulties, such as the isolation experienced by all new faculty members, can be magnified when a faculty member is part of an underrepresented group. Thus, while many of the phenomena this report describes may also affect majority faculty members, the findings suggest that the intersection of underrepresented identity status with other factors can render commonly experienced problems particularly acute for URM faculty.
- We are not aware of similar qualitative studies on URM faculty experiences at peer institutions. While the study cannot speak to the experiences of URM faculty at other institutions, the general patterns described in this report may be shared by URM faculty at other elite research universities. Even though the design of this study did not allow us to say what phenomena, if any, are unique to Stanford, existing social science research on race/ethnicity and gender do point to general mechanisms similar to those described in this report.

Sample characteristics

For purposes of this study, "underrepresented minority" (URM) designation was considered in the context of U.S. academia as a whole, covering faculty from three major racial/ethnic minority groups identified in university records as Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino/a, or Native American/Alaskan Native.[4] This categorization did not include faculty whose race/ethnicity was not specified in university records, nor did it include faculty from racial/ethnic groups (e.g., Asians/Asian Americans) underrepresented in certain academic disciplines (for example, the humanities and social sciences), but not in others. While imperfect, the URM categorization was the best method available for identifying faculty of color from groups underrepresented in academia.

The population for the study included all URM Assistant, Associate and Full Professors at Stanford, in all categories — Tenure Line, Non-Tenure Line Research and Teaching, Medical Center Line, and Clinician Educator[5] Line. The population was restricted to 119 URM faculty members who had been at Stanford for at least one academic year (appointment date of 9/1/2009 or before). In total, 52 interviews were conducted.[6] Interview participants have the following demographic characteristics, and are representative of the URM population of the Stanford professoriate with respect to school, rank, and race/ethnicity:

- The participants included about equal numbers of Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino/a faculty members, in addition to a small number of Native Americans/Alaskan Natives.[7]
- 32 participants are male (62%); 20 participants are female (38%).
- 15 participants are assistant professors at the time of interview (29%); 15 participants are associate professors (29%); and 22 participants are full professors (42%).
- All seven of Stanford's schools were represented in the sample.

4 In this report, we use the terms for race and ethnicity categories as they appear in the University's faculty database. We use inclusive, broad categories (e.g., "Hispanic/Latino/a" instead of "Hispanic" or "Latino/a") for two reasons. First, we do not know how each participant would prefer to be identified. Second, the broader categories assist in protecting participants' confidentiality.

5 Clinician Educators (CE's) are not part of the Professoriate as defined in the Faculty Handbook. However, as of October 15, 2010, CE's comprise about 42% of what the School of Medicine characterizes as its faculty. Our participants included a handful of CE's. In this report, we do not discuss issues particular to CE's; however, we do include them in analyses where their experiences are illustrative of more general processes of recognition and collegiality.

6 The overall participation rate was 44%. The participation rate within each rank (assistant, associate, and full professors) and within each URM category was over 40%, respectively. Female faculty had a higher participation rate than male faculty (54% of women who were invited participated in an interview compared to 39% of the men who were invited). Participants' times at Stanford range from one year to over 30 years.

7 The exact proportion of participants in each URM category is not listed to protect confidentiality of the small number of Native American/Alaskan Native participants.

- School of Medicine (SoM) faculty were 44% of the interview participants.[8] Among SoM participants, over 60% were Medical Center Line (MCL) faculty, and a small number were Clinician Educators. Because a primary role of MCL faculty and CE's is clinical practice, their experiences with regard to recognition and collegiality are not necessarily comparable to University Tenure Line (UTL) faculty. In this report, we identify the responses of MCL and CE faculty when doing so would not compromise participants' confidentiality.

Study procedures

Interviews

To ensure confidentiality, consultants hired specifically for this project conducted the interviews. Consultants were chosen who had extensive professional experience conducting personal interviews with URM populations. They were diverse in race/ethnicity and gender. None of the consultant interviewers were Stanford faculty members, but most had significant experience with the Stanford community. Recognizing the sensitivity of discussing race and ethnicity in a campus environment, participants were provided biographies and pictures of the interviewers, and offered the option of selecting their interviewer from among the consultants.

Informed consent was obtained before each interview. The interviews lasted from half an hour to an hour and half, with an average of about 45 minutes, and they were recorded and transcribed. The interview protocol (see Appendix A) was semi-structured, allowing interviewers to phrase questions in their own words, proceed through the questions in an order that fit the flow of the conversation, ask follow-up questions, and spend time on those topics most relevant to each interviewee.

8 This percentage was similar to that for the Stanford faculty overall: 44% of all professorial faculty on campus are in the School of Medicine.

Data Analysis

The interview data were analyzed using an inductive approach. A small sample of transcripts was read to generate a list of thematic codes. The coding scheme was applied to a second sample of transcripts, and then revised in an iterative process to include further refinement of codes and themes. Members of the panel read sub-samples of the transcripts, and provided feedback on the coding scheme.

Confidentiality

The following measures were taken to protect the confidentiality of the participants and the interview data:

- Prior to participation, participants were given a list of names of people who would have access to the transcripts. Only members of the Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life, personnel in the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity, and research assistants had access to the transcripts.
- Interview recordings were transcribed and recordings erased. Paper copies of the interview transcripts were stored in a locked file cabinet in a locked office on campus, accessible only to panel members and approved research analysts while in the office.
- Participants were given an opportunity to review the draft report incorporating proposed quotes from their interviews before its release.

In presenting data and findings in the reports, we took the following steps to ensure that no identifying information about participants in the project would be released:

- No accounts, even if they speak directly to the research questions, were included in this report when the identity of the participant could not be sufficiently obscured given the details of the anecdotes.
- When quoting or citing examples from the interviews, we identify a participant's race/ethnicity, gender, rank, and/or school where it is both relevant and possible to do so without violating

confidentiality. Because there are very few URM faculty in the School of Education, School of Law, and the Graduate School of Business, references to faculty members in these schools are grouped under the term "Professional School." Similarly, references to faculty in the School of Engineering, School of Earth Sciences, and faculty in the natural sciences division of the School of Humanities & Sciences are grouped under the term "Sciences and Engineering." Because the School of Medicine has many more URM faculty than other schools, it is possible to identify a quote as coming from the School of Medicine more frequently than in the case of other schools (including those in the MCL).

- The term "academic unit" refers to a faculty member's academic location. It is often an academic department, but it can also be a division in a large clinical department, or school. This report uses the term "unit" to protect confidentiality when using another term would risk identifying the participant.
- While there were Native American participants in the project, no quotes are attributed to Native American faculty members because the project team felt they would be identifiable by context, given the small number of Native American faculty members at Stanford (fewer than five at the time this study was conducted). Because of confidentiality commitments, some issues of particular concern to Native American faculty are not fully addressed in this report.

Overview of report

The report that follows starts with an Executive Summary in which we present the key findings on two main themes: feeling valued and recognized, and collegiality and isolation. Following the Executive Summary is a list of recommendations proposed by the panel based on these findings. Since the 2008 Quality of Life survey, Stanford University has implemented a number of programs and initiatives to enhance faculty diversity. These efforts are described at the beginning of the panel recommendations. A longer report in which we present detailed analyses on the two themes is available upon request.

Executive Summary

The 2008 Quality of Life Survey found that while general satisfaction with being a faculty member at Stanford was quite high, underrepresented minority (URM)[9] faculty experienced lower satisfaction compared to their non-minority peers on several items. To better understand these findings, the Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life conducted a follow-up study from fall 2010 to spring 2011, interviewing 52 URM faculty members (18 of whom were not in the academic council faculty lines) concerning their experiences at Stanford. We focused on topics that were shown in the 2008 Quality of Life Survey to be the most important predictors of satisfaction, and present the findings in two reports. The current report focuses on two themes: 1) Feeling Valued and Recognized and 2) Collegiality and Isolation. A subsequent report (to be released in Fall 2013) will focus on the themes of mentoring, department culture and voice in decision-making.

The following six findings represent the most prominent shared experiences among these URM faculty with respect to recognition, collegiality and isolation. For the most part, participants relate to their experiences as faculty without explicit references to their URM (and/or gender) identities, and their accounts are applicable to the more general experiences of being an academic and being at Stanford. The in-depth interviews reveal, however, that some of these general processes are moderated by these faculty members' URM status.

1. Faculty feel valued, recognized, and part of a collegial environment when colleagues engage with and express appreciation for their scholarship.

Not surprisingly, intellectual interactions with colleagues were the clearest signals about value and the strongest indicators of collegiality. Some of the primary types of intellectual engagement mentioned include research collaboration, reading and giving feedback on each other's work (which can be especially important for junior faculty), being invited to colleagues' talks or having colleagues attend one's own talks, and having conversations about research in informal settings such as in the hallway or over email.

2. Faculty often experience "research isolation" when they lack colleagues whose research is similar enough to provide feedback or to collaborate with.

Over 40% of the URM faculty interviewed reported experiencing "research isolation," which also leads to a sense of being undervalued. This theme emerged even though faculty were not asked specifically about research isolation. Research isolation is often interpreted as a result of an academic and institutional culture in which everyone is "too busy" and works independently; it is experienced more acutely in the following situations:

1) When a participant's specialization was viewed as marginal to the field or perceived as less central to the unit mission.
2) When the participant was underrepresented in her or his academic unit because of ascriptive characteristics—i.e., being a member of an underrepresented minority group or being a woman in a male-dominated unit.
3) When assistant professors had trouble finding appropriate mentors.

9 For purposes of this study, the URM faculty consists of Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino/a, and Native American/Alaskan Native faculty.

3. Some faculty members feel that scholarship on race/ethnicity is marginalized in their campus units. Stanford's Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity (CCSRE) and the race/ethnic community centers provide a needed collegial home for faculty members whose scholarship focuses on race/ethnicity.

Research on race, ethnicity, and/or gender was described as being seen by some as peripheral to their disciplines and units. Marginalization of race/ethnicity/gender scholarship often led to or amplified research isolation for two reasons.

- First, some majority colleagues were described as not reading or engaging with scholarship on race or ethnicity.
- Second, some units were reported to be unwilling to devote additional billets to faculty pursuing race/ethnicity scholarship, leaving those faculty members without colleagues who share their concerns.

Over one third of the participants regarded CCSRE as a much-needed venue for connecting over race/ethnicity scholarship and for forming collegial relationships, given the perceived marginalization of these concerns in some campus units. Some also mentioned other race/ethnic community centers on campus.

4. URM faculty perceive that they perform a disproportionate amount of diversity-related university service and feel that such service is often not recognized or rewarded by unit leadership.

Many participants articulated deep personal commitments to diversity-related university service, but they also expressed a common view that URM faculty do extra service because of their race, ethnicity, and/or gender, and that there was a lack of recognition of their efforts and a lack of awareness of the cost of the service demands placed on them.

- Many participants reported that their unit leadership was not aware of their participation in university-wide activities.
- Participants said they had less time for research, and some worried about tenure and promotion given the amount of diversity-related service work they had taken on.
- Participants' accounts reveal that often the promotion of diversity and support for students of color is seen as the responsibility solely of faculty of color, rather than as a responsibility shared by *all faculty members.*
- Many participants argued that hiring more URM faculty was necessary to prevent overburdening the existing URM faculty with service demands.

5. Women and URM faculty members may be less likely to engage in self-promotion than their white male counterparts. When they do, their self-advocacy behavior may be less well received than the same behavior from their white male counterparts. This leads to misperceptions or lack of recognition of their scholarly success in Stanford's culture.

Though there was not a question on the interview protocol concerning self-promotion, comments about the need for self-promotion emerged in the analysis.

- Many participants articulated the belief that unless faculty advocate strongly for themselves, they do not get recognized for their work, and in order to forge collegial relationships, faculty need to be proactive in reaching out to their colleagues and asking for what they need.
- Some participants expressed a belief that women and/or URM faculty are less likely to be self-promoting than their white, male colleagues, due to gender socialization and racial/ethnic cultural upbringing, a belief that is consistent with social science research. This puts women and URM faculty at a disadvantage in contexts that reward self-advocacy.
- Some participants described resistance from unit leaders and colleagues when they tried to advocate for themselves, and they attributed this resistance to their identities as women or underrepresented minorities.

6. A collegial work environment that communicates value and respect for a faculty member's work is critical to satisfaction and increases the likelihood of remaining at Stanford.

A primary finding of the Quality of Life survey was that perceptions of the supportiveness of one's unit and colleagues were the best predictors in regression models of satisfaction and the likeliness of staying at Stanford.[10] This finding was corroborated in the present study. Many participants' accounts included comments that tied overall satisfaction and retention to the themes of value, recognition, collegiality, and isolation.

- Participant accounts showed that thoughts of leaving Stanford can be prompted by indirect signals from leadership and colleagues that one's work is not valued, or a decline in perceived collegiality.
- The implication is that Stanford's goal of attracting and retaining a diverse faculty depends critically on faculty experiencing collegial environments in which their scholarly and service contributions are valued and recognized.

Based on these general findings, the Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life offers initial recommendations to the provost about how the university can improve the academic environment for URM faculty.

10 See *Special Report on Regression Analyses of Predictors of Faculty Satisfaction and Intention to Remain at Stanford*, page 57, *Report on the Quality of Life of Stanford Faculty*, available at https://facultydevelopment.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/documents/fqol-report-jan2010.pdf.

Recommendations from the Panel on Faculty Equity and Quality of Life

EXISTING PROGRAMS FOR FACULTY DIVERSITY

University leaders recognize the importance of diversity (broadly defined) in higher education and are committed to increasing it. In the past five years (fall 2007 to fall 2012), for example, the number of URM professorial faculty members at Stanford increased from 102 to 146 (a 40% growth compared to a 9% increase of all professorial faculty). A number of university efforts have been successful in recruiting and retaining minority and other diverse faculty members.

- Since 2002, the **Faculty Incentive Fund** (FIF) and its recently expanded version have, among other things, facilitated the hiring of over 80 minority and women faculty members in various schools; over 90% of these faculty hires have remained at Stanford.
- The **Faculty Development Initiative** (FDI), a program jointly administered by the Office of the Provost and CCSRE within the School of Humanities and Sciences, was established in 2008. Since then, the program has recruited 11 faculty members in several departments in the School of Humanities and Sciences and in the School of Education.
- Since 2008, the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity has developed and continues to improve the online **Faculty Search Toolkit** to facilitate diversity efforts in faculty searches by providing access to systematic resources to extend outreach to diverse applicant pools and information on understanding implicit biases that may occur in the faculty search process.
- The **Distinguished Alumni Scholars Day** (DAS) was established in 2006 as an institutional response to the scarce presence of diverse racial/ethnic group members within the faculty ranks of our nation's colleges and universities, and within the Ph.D. programs that produce these faculty. This program aims to bring Stanford students from groups underrepresented in academia into contact with distinguished alumni scholars from a broad range of backgrounds, disciplines, and institutional types to inspire new generations of students to consider academia as a career. Between 2006 and 2010, the program successfully brought back four sets of scholars, with 8 to 19 scholars in each of the years the program was run.
- **Distinguished Scholars Lectures** (DSL) were launched as a new program in Spring 2012 with funding from the Provost. The program continues the mission of the Distinguished Alumni Scholars Day. This program gives participating schools and departments identified by the Vice Provosts of Graduate Education, Undergraduate Education, and Faculty Development and Diversity an opportunity to expose students to diverse faculty by bringing distinguished scholars (including but not limited to alumni) to Stanford for short visits, typically two to three days. The lecture and its associated events are developed and sponsored jointly by participating schools and departments, and the Provost's Office.

In addition to these recruitment efforts, in 2009, **The President's Awards for Excellence through Diversity Program** was established to recognize and honor individuals and programs that have made exceptional contributions to enhancing and supporting diversity, broadly defined, within the Stanford community. Since its inception, diversity awards to individuals have been given to four faculty members for their leadership and service in increasing diversity among students and faculty within their disciplines and the Stanford community at large. A similar number of programs

have also been recognized for their contributions to diversity broadly defined.

ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS

As the university continues its efforts to increase diversity among its faculty and reward individual and programmatic contributions to this goal, the findings from this report also highlight the need to:

1) Increase the level of visible recognition of URM faculty and their scholarship;
2) Improve collegiality among faculty on the Stanford campus to effectively integrate URM faculty;
3 Decrease the isolation felt by some URM faculty members, particularly those whose scholarship addresses areas that are highly specialized or perceived to be marginalized;
4) Decrease the burden on URM faculty for diversity-related university service, and give appropriate recognition to faculty who do conduct diversity-related research and service;
5) Develop mechanisms for faculty to be self-advocates without violating their personal or social sensibilities;
6) Develop faculty leadership and unit practices to reduce the reliance on self-advocacy.
7) Expand faculty leadership to recognize the URM faculty experience, to coach new faculty members, and to provide supportive and constructive feedback that allows for the effective integration of new underrepresented faculty into Stanford's academic networks.

PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

Since all faculty members experience similar environments to some degree, we expect that many of the following recommendations will be beneficial to all faculty. However, being a member of an underrepresented minority group may exacerbate feelings of isolation. Consequently, some of the recommendations are directed specifically at ways to improve the environment for URM faculty.

We present our recommendations as a series of goals and suggested actions to be undertaken by the university, schools, departments and/or the faculty at large.

Goal #1: Increase the number of URM faculty.

A key reason why URM faculty members feel isolated is that they are numerically few on campus. Self-identified URM faculty comprised 6% of the university professoriate at the time of the interviews (fall 2010), and about 8% by fall 2012.

Recommended Actions:

1) Expand successful programs such as FDI and FIF that aim to broadly diversify Stanford's faculty, assess and highlight the scholarly contributions of these programs over time.

2) Strategic Recruitment and Hiring:

   a. Establish diversity recruitment standards and practices in departmental strategic plans, with direct accountability to School Deans. Clearly articulate the educational benefits for the institution to address issues of underrepresentation and diversity more broadly.

   b. Develop cluster hire initiatives when possible around areas of scholarship likely to promote diverse hires. Hiring faculty in clusters should also promote interaction around research, which has been shown to decrease the isolation experienced by URM faculty. For example, a cluster hire initiative could be structured around hiring scholars who conduct research on effective diversity programs in organizations. Another example would be a cluster around those who conduct research on population health disparities. The School of Education has been successful in using this strategy.

   c. Help address academic pipeline issues by developing opportunities to build and cultivate potential faculty among recent graduates and postdoctoral fellows. This

could be achieved through endowing a postdoctoral fellows program that brings in scholars with recent PhDs who might be competitive for faculty positions at Stanford and who would bring diversity (broadly defined) to the professoriate. Develop partnerships with existing successful programs at other institutions for potential recruits to obtain shorter-term fellowships or visiting appointments at Stanford.

3) Improve the procedures and support for diversity efforts in faculty search processes:

   a. Develop a plan for involving deans and department chairs across the schools in oversight of faculty search processes. Some departments are perceived as having no clear system in place for oversight of diversity efforts in faculty searches.

   b. Continue to provide search committees with information about the challenges and biases inherent in recruitment and hiring decisions, and inform the committees (as is being done in several schools) of implicit ways in which the search and hiring process impact those candidates who are underrepresented in their disciplines.

   c. Build technical infrastructure that provides access by committees to diverse pools of applicants, and conversely access to positions by prospective diverse applicants. Leverage technology to track the application, selection and hiring processes, with minimal burden on local resources through efforts such as the faculty search toolkit under development in the FDD office.

Goal #2: Increase opportunities for faculty to interact over research.

While the 2008 Quality of Life Survey shows that perceived collegiality was generally high,[11] interviews with many URM faculty reveal a commonly felt sense of research isolation. On the other hand, one of the key findings from the report suggests a solution to this issue, that interacting over research increases faculty members' sense of inclusion and of feeling valued. Junior faculty members were especially positive about the benefits of these opportunities.

Recommended Actions:

1) Increase financial, symbolic and organizational support for centers and other forums that effectively promote research related interactions among URM faculty, such as CCSRE.

2) Provide direct logistical and financial support to junior faculty writing/research groups that span departments or units, similar to those facilitated by the VPGE for graduate students.

3) Encourage departments or clusters of departments within similar broad disciplinary areas to develop ways in which faculty can easily learn about each other's research and research accomplishments, in both academic and social settings, such as the Humanities Center Annual Celebration of Publications. Ensure that these mechanisms are highly visible and equally accessible to all faculty. Mechanisms should not rely solely on self-promotion. Some mechanisms include (but are not limited to):

   a. Sharing research accomplishments at faculty meetings or other significant faculty events.

   b. Including research awards and accomplishments in department newsletters or email announcements such as that done by the English department, as one example.

   c. Sponsoring periodic research colloquia in which faculty present their research.

While many departments have some of these mechanisms in place, it is recommended that they regularly check the effectiveness of such mechanisms for bringing faculty members together.

11 On the overall indexes and specific items on supportive unit and supportive colleagues, the average scores are usually around 4 "agree". Women, URM, and Asian faculty have lower scores on some items than male non-minority faculty at Stanford; however, compared to 6 peer research universities, Stanford indexes are on par or slightly higher.

Goal #3: Value and recognize diversity-related service.

There are many effective efforts on campus to promote diversity and many URM faculty members actively participate in those efforts. This report finds that URM faculty are deeply committed to these activities, but also feel that their diversity-related service is not always recognized or sufficiently valued. In addition, URM faculty members sometimes feel overburdened with the amount of diversity-related service requested of them.

Recommended Actions:

1) All faculty should be expected to be involved in diversity-related efforts since diversity is of broad institutional and educational value. Each school should develop a way to involve a broader spectrum of faculty in these efforts, to systematically review service that contributes to diversity at Stanford, and to reward such contributions by including them in considerations when making decisions related to salary, resources or appointments to leadership positions. Diversity service could be acknowledged by including a section on faculty annual reports where faculty members are asked to list their diversity related service. Having all faculty report on their diversity related service conveys the expectation that all faculty are responsible for fostering an environment where all faculty can thrive.
2) School and department leaders should regularly review the service commitments of URM faculty, including diversity-related service at the university level, and ensure that these faculty members are not being asked to perform a disproportionate amount of service.

Goal #4: Improve the level of collegiality on campus.

Participants who experienced isolation or lack of collegiality often felt that these negative experiences were the result of the overall busyness of the Stanford faculty and were generally not intentional. The committee's recommendations reflect our belief that collegiality can be improved through systematic assessment of department culture and by explicit attention to collegiality as a goal.

Recommended Actions:

1) As a practice of sound organizational renewal and leadership, each of Stanford's seven schools should undergo a regular review of its culture with respect to the level of collegiality among its faculty members.
2) Incorporate leadership training for new and continuing chairs and other department and division leaders that would allow for the sharing of best practices for creating more collegial environments. Department chairs should be asked to share what they are doing to promote collegiality. Current examples include the School of Earth Sciences' Respectful Workplaces training for its faculty, and the School of Medicine's Leadership training and Faculty Fellows programs.
3) The university should promote a sense of community among the faculty by increasing awareness of collegiality as a goal, and provide incentives to support efforts that aim to enhance it. For example, use strategic internal communication to highlight and recognize the many ways faculty engage as members of a Stanford community, creating a stimulating, supportive and productive academic environment. Activities that promote collegiality could be highlighted, such as: team-teaching, public recognition of research and service, research partnerships, and new faculty workspaces.
4) The university should foster an on-going dialogue among faculty about inclusion, with special attention to the experiences of URM faculty. We believe this report and the subsequent report to be released on mentoring, department culture and decision-making can help foster this dialogue.


LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY
DIE LUFT DER FREIHEIT WEHT
1891