

# Faculty Staff Development Subcommittee Report

---

To the President's Advisory Committee For  
Making Excellence Inclusive

## **Introduction**

The President's Advisory Committee for Making Excellence Inclusive is responsible for making recommendations to the President on issues related to creating and sustaining a thriving, inclusive campus community.

In support of the PAC, the Faculty Staff Development Subcommittee was charged to with learning more about current development initiatives on campus and best practices for creating a culture of inclusion.

### *Overall Role and Responsibility*

The Faculty and Staff Development Subcommittee will identify and recommend programs/initiatives that help faculty and staff create and sustain inclusivity in the classroom, support the recruiting and onboarding of more faculty and staff from underrepresented groups, and enable all faculty and staff to foster and experience a thriving, inclusive university community.

### *Specific Responsibilities*

The specific responsibilities of the Faculty and Staff Development Subcommittee include:

- Review current best practices for building and sustaining thriving communities;
- Develop recommendations informed by data.

### *Input from Stakeholders*

To develop recommendations, the Faculty and Staff Development Subcommittee, at a minimum would like to hear from the following campus stakeholders and subject matter experts:

Terry Dolson– former Co-Chair of the FLC

Jonathan Zur – President of Virginia Center for Inclusive Communities

Keeling and Associates

Bernadette Costello – Director of Talent and Organizational Effectiveness

## **Membership**

The Faculty Staff Development Subcommittee includes representation from across the University community, including students, staff and faculty:

- Javier Hidalgo – Associate Professor of Leadership Studies – Co-Chair
- Carl Sorensen – Sr. AVP, Human Resources – Co-Chair
- Jesse Amankwaah – Student
- Allison Archer – Assistant Professor of Leadership Studies
- Chantelle Bernard – Associate Director of Multicultural Affairs and Disability Services

- Ryan Brazell – Academic Technology Consultant - Social Sciences Liaison
- Ashelle Brown – Learning and Development Specialist
- Kristjen Lundberg – Assistant Professor of Social Psychology
- Tom Nicholas – Associate Director of Admission
- Noella Park – Student
- Omar Quintero – Assistant Professor of Biology
- Doug Szajda – Associate Professor of Computer Science
- Josh Wroniewicz – Director of Purchasing

## Areas of Focus

### Section 1: Inclusive Pedagogy

Inclusive pedagogy refers to “a student-centered approach to teaching that pays attention to the varied background, learning styles, and abilities of all the learners in front of you.”<sup>1</sup> Inclusive pedagogy involves evidence-based teaching strategies to improve the learning outcomes for all students. We understand “inclusive pedagogy” as an outcome. If teaching strategies effectively improve outcomes for all learners, then these strategies are examples of inclusive pedagogy.

A growing body of evidence suggests that certain teaching strategies promote learning and retention for underrepresented students. Here’s some evidence:

- Highly-structured courses that involve frequent low-stakes assessments disproportionately benefit underrepresented students.<sup>2</sup>
- Growth mindset interventions seem to have some benefits for women and minority students, although the evidence for this claim is somewhat mixed.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://cndls.georgetown.edu/inclusive-pedagogy/>

<sup>2</sup> Sarah L. Eddy and Kelly A. Hogan, “Getting under the Hood: How and for Whom Does Increasing Course Structure Work?,” *CBE Life Sciences Education* 13, no. 3 (2014): 453–68, <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.14-03-0050>; James W. Pennebaker, Samuel D. Gosling, and Jason D. Ferrell, “Daily Online Testing in Large Classes: Boosting College Performance While Reducing Achievement Gaps,” *PLOS ONE* 8, no. 11 (November 20, 2013): e79774, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0079774>; David C. Haak et al., “Increased Structure and Active Learning Reduce the Achievement Gap in Introductory Biology,” *Science* 332, no. 6034 (June 3, 2011): 1213, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1204820>.

<sup>3</sup> Michael Broda et al., *Reducing Inequality in Academic Success for Incoming College Students: A Randomized Trial of Growth Mindset and Belonging Interventions*, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2018.1429037>; Victoria F. Sisk et al., “To What Extent and Under Which Circumstances Are Growth Mind-Sets Important to Academic Achievement? Two Meta-Analyses,” *Psychological Science* 29, no. 4 (March 5, 2018): 549–71, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617739704>.

- Interventions that promote a sense of social belonging among minority students improve academic outcomes.<sup>4</sup>
- Active learning strategies decrease failure rates and appear to benefit underrepresented groups.<sup>5</sup>

There is growing support for inclusive pedagogy at the University of Richmond. Existing initiatives include:

- The University has hosted the ACS Inclusive Pedagogy Institute and a faculty learning community focuses on inclusive pedagogy.
- There will be a day-long training in inclusive pedagogy that will be open to all faculty on May 8, 2019.
- There have been several inclusive pedagogy faculty learning communities (Cross-School Inclusive Pedagogy and Inclusive Pedagogy in STEM).
- The University of Richmond has implemented an innovative and award-winning program to include more underrepresented students in the sciences (URISE: University of Richmond Integrated Science Experience).

These initiatives are promising developments in promoting inclusive and evidenced-based pedagogy at the University. However, we have identified some potential barriers to promoting inclusive pedagogy at UR. We discuss these barriers below.

#### *Fragmentation and Unknown Implementation*

The promotion of inclusive pedagogy is fragmented. We consulted with faculty and staff who facilitate inclusive pedagogy at UR, and they generally agree that there is a need for more coordination between inclusive pedagogy initiatives on campus. There is a sense that many different faculty groups are “reinventing the wheel” when it comes to inclusive pedagogy and that efforts to promote inclusive pedagogy would benefit from more cross-campus coordination.

Furthermore, we have questions about how often faculty integrate evidenced-based inclusive pedagogy strategies in their classrooms. According to Keeling’s final report: students “in our meetings noted that some, but not all, faculty are interested in tools and support to improve inclusive pedagogy and classroom climate.” While the University has several initiatives to promote inclusive pedagogy, we do not know of any attempt to study whether faculty have

---

<sup>4</sup> Gregory M. Walton and Geoffrey L. Cohen, “A Brief Social-Belonging Intervention Improves Academic and Health Outcomes of Minority Students,” *Science* 331, no. 6023 (March 18, 2011): 1447, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1198364>.

<sup>5</sup> Scott Freeman et al., “Active Learning Increases Student Performance in Science, Engineering, and Mathematics,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, no. 23 (June 10, 2014): 8410, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111>.

implemented these strategies and, if they have, whether this implementation has improved outcomes for students.

### *Barriers to Implementation*

While we lack data about whether faculty are implementing evidence-based pedagogy at UR, we have some reason to suspect that implementation remains uneven. Other universities have attempted to study whether faculty implement evidence-based instructional techniques, and they find that many--perhaps most--faculty decline to use these techniques. For example, a study at the University of Virginia surveyed faculty and found that the lecture remains the predominant instructional method, despite decades of research suggesting that lectures are often ineffective at promoting student learning.<sup>6</sup> The researchers asked faculty why they avoided using active learning and other evidence-based techniques and faculty cited several factors, including: (1) lack of time for planning new instructional strategies, (2) tenure and promotion guidelines that emphasize research over teaching, (3) student resistance to active learning, and (4) lack of training in evidence-based practices. Another major factor seems to be departmental culture. Faculty members say that if their departments do not support active learning, then individual faculty members are less likely to try it.

We suspect that similar factors prevent compliance with evidence-based pedagogy at UR. While tenure and promotion guidelines at UR may emphasize research less than those at UVA, the other factors cited in the study likely apply to UR faculty as well, such as lack of time for planning, student resistance, and lack of training. However, a first step to studying this issue at UR would be to collect data on instructional practices. We recommend that the University take steps to study instructional practices by, for instance, surveying faculty about their use of inclusive pedagogy and possible barriers to implementation that they confront.

### *The Problem of Incentives for Inclusive Pedagogy*

Above we noted that it is unclear how many UR faculty implement evidence-based teaching strategies. One cause for concern is whether faculty have the right incentives to implement strategies to improve learning. Even if faculty are familiar with inclusive pedagogy, it's possible that they'll decline to implement evidence-based strategies in the classroom.

Many faculty at the University of Richmond are evaluated primarily on the basis of student evaluation instruments (SEIs). The University of Richmond Teaching and Scholarship Initiative Committee argues:

---

<sup>6</sup> Beth Mcmurtrie, "Many Professors Want to Change Their Teaching but Don't. One University Found Out Why.," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 21, 2019, <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Many-Professors-Want-to-Change/245945>.

In the tenure and promotion process, there is no clear criteria in what it means to be excellent as teachers. We have ways of bringing in external evaluators, but student evaluations and our own assessments have been the main source of information.<sup>7</sup>

However, there is reason to believe that SEIs fail to incentivize faculty to implement evidence-based learning strategies and inclusive pedagogies. A growing body of evidence finds that SEIs have at best a modest relationship with actual learning and may even be negatively correlated with learning in certain cases.<sup>8</sup> Only a handful of studies have used randomized controlled trials to study the relationship between student evaluations and learning outcomes, and they find that there is a negative correlation between student evaluations and learning.<sup>9</sup> That is, students give more effective professors lower evaluations.

Here's an illustration of the problem of student resistance. In a large-scale experiment, psychologists at the University of Texas-Austin implemented a more structured curriculum in their introduction to psychology course. The course required students to complete a daily quiz in the beginning of each class. This intervention generated substantial gains in learning. Moreover, the authors report that the "new system resulted in a 50% reduction in the achievement gap as measured by grades among students of different social classes."<sup>10</sup> However, the authors report that students rated this version of the course much lower than previous iterations of the course, even though the more structured course had better and more equitable learning outcomes. There is more general evidence that student resistance discourages faculty from adopting effective methods. In a study of why physics instructors decline to adopt research-based instructional strategies, researchers conclude that: "when they actually try to implement [research-based instructional strategies] they are faced with difficulties, such as student complaints...."<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> University of Richmond Teaching and Scholarship Initiative Committee Report, p. 8.

<sup>8</sup> Dennis E. Clayson, "Student Evaluations of Teaching: Are They Related to What Students Learn?: A Meta-Analysis and Review of the Literature," *Journal of Marketing Education* 31, no. 1 (October 13, 2008): 16–30, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475308324086>; Wolfgang Stroebe, "Why Good Teaching Evaluations May Reward Bad Teaching: On Grade Inflation and Other Unintended Consequences of Student Evaluations," *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11, no. 6 (November 1, 2016): 800–816, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616650284>.

<sup>9</sup> Nate Kornell and Hannah Hausman, "Do the Best Teachers Get the Best Ratings?," *Frontiers in Psychology* 7 (April 25, 2016): 570–570, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00570>; Scott E. Carrell and James E. West, "Does Professor Quality Matter? Evidence from Random Assignment of Students to Professors," *Journal of Political Economy* 118, no. 3 (June 1, 2010): 409–32, <https://doi.org/10.1086/653808>; Michela Braga, Marco Paccagnella, and Michele Pellizzari, "Evaluating Students' Evaluations of Professors," *Economics of Education Review* 41 (August 1, 2014): 71–88, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2014.04.002>.

<sup>10</sup> Pennebaker, Gosling, and Ferrell, "Daily Online Testing in Large Classes: Boosting College Performance While Reducing Achievement Gaps."

<sup>11</sup> Charles Henderson, Melissa Dancy, and Magdalena Niewiadomska-Bugaj, "Use of Research-Based Instructional Strategies in Introductory Physics: Where Do Faculty Leave the Innovation-Decision Process?," *Physical Review Special Topics - Physics Education Research* 8, no. 2 (July 31, 2012): 020104, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.8.020104>.

To our knowledge, faculty and staff at the University of Richmond have never conducted research on whether SEIs are associated with better learning outcomes at this institution. But, if the research on student evaluations generalizes to UR, then we would expect student evaluations to only have a weak relationship with teaching effectiveness as measured by learning.

We see the problem as follows: Inclusive pedagogy techniques are unlikely to be adopted if faculty lack a clear incentive to implement them. But the main criteria of assessment--SEIs--may fail to reward faculty for implementing these techniques, especially if they increase the perceived difficulty of coursework. Thus, even if the University creates workshops and trainings that promote inclusive pedagogy, it's possible that these initiatives will have minimal impact unless the incentives of faculty change.

### *Other Concerns About SEIs*

The research also suggests that SEIs exhibit biases against women and faculty of color.<sup>12</sup> In the report from the University of Richmond Teaching and Scholarship Initiative Committee, one faculty member commented:

[UR should get] rid of SEIS because they are racist and sexist tool that does not accurately measure teaching effectiveness. IF, we decide to keep this racist and sexist tool, then allow professors to use them for developmental purposes--provide training for chairs, administrators and T&P on how to identify the biases inherent in these racist & sexist instruments--AND support for the marginalized faculty who are subjected to these racist and misogynistic evals. Evaluations should also be changed to focus on measure learning outcomes instead of popularity and conformity to white male norms.<sup>13</sup>

Anecdotal evidence suggests that female faculty and faculty from underrepresented groups experience the priority placed on SEIs to be demoralizing and stressful. Although we lack systematic evidence to demonstrate this, the heavy emphasis on SEIs may be demoralizing to faculty from underrepresented groups and hinder efforts at retention.

### *Intergroup Dialogue and Managing Difficult Conversations*

Another possible area of improvement involves managing difficult conversations in the classrooms. According to Keeling & Associates' report, only half of those surveyed agree that

---

<sup>12</sup> Lillian MacNell, Adam Driscoll, and Andrea N. Hunt, "What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching," *Innovative Higher Education* 40, no. 4 (August 1, 2015): 291–303, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4>; Natascha Wagner, Matthias Rieger, and Katherine Voorvelt, "Gender, Ethnicity and Teaching Evaluations: Evidence from Mixed Teaching Teams," *Economics of Education Review* 54 (October 1, 2016): 79–94, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.06.004>.

<sup>13</sup> University of Richmond Teaching and Scholarship Initiative Committee Report

“Students at UR who have different political or ideological views engage with each other in a respectful manner.” This suggests that UR has room for improvement in promoting respectful dialogue on controversial questions. One possibility is that professors at UR can be better trained to model and facilitate respectful disagreement and debate between opposing views in the classroom. Possible strategies for handling difficult conversations in the classroom include silent debates, fishbowl debates, reflective structured dialogue, creating space for post-discussion reflections, and other strategies.<sup>14</sup> Yet faculty may lack training in how to conduct effective debates or hold difficult conversations in the classroom. Other universities have created training workshops for managing difficult conversations.<sup>15</sup> The University may wish to explore a similar option for encouraging productive dialogue.

Several universities have also pioneered “intergroup dialogue” in order to promote shared understanding and tolerance on campus. Intergroup dialogue is a face-to-face, interactive, and facilitated learning experience that brings together a small number of students over the course of weeks in order to explore commonalities and differences. The goal of intergroup dialogue is to build relationships and understanding across different social identities. Participants are often drawn from different social identities and they must reflect on their own social identities, gain knowledge of intergroup issues and conflicts, and engage in dialogue. Typically, these groups are guided by trained facilitators and they are embedded in an academic curriculum (they are often part of a course or academic program). A body of evidence suggests that intergroup dialogue has beneficial outcomes. In particular, it appears that participating in intergroup dialogue enhances students’ ability to engage in “perspective-taking” and intercultural communication skills, and causes more positive intergroup perceptions among students.<sup>16</sup>

How is intergroup dialogue related to faculty development? Intergroup dialogue requires facilitators. These are typically (but not always) faculty members who integrate intergroup dialogue into courses. This is related to faculty and staff development in the following respects: (1) faculty and staff generally need training in order to successfully facilitate intergroup dialogue, and (2) faculty may need to redesign courses to accommodate intergroup dialogue. This suggests a role for faculty and staff development. If UR wants to promote intergroup dialogue, then it will be necessary to provide training and assistance for faculty and staff who would like to create courses built around intergroup dialogue.

Other universities, such as the University of Michigan, have created thriving programs for intergroup dialogue that provide regular training for faculty, staff, and sometimes students to lead intergroup dialogues. Liberal arts colleges such as Colgate and Hope College have also

---

<sup>14</sup> These and other strategies are discussed in “Start Talking: A Handbook for Engaging Difficult Dialogues in Higher Education” available at [http://www.difficultdialoguesuaa.org/images/uploads/Start\\_Talking\\_full\\_book\\_pdf.pdf](http://www.difficultdialoguesuaa.org/images/uploads/Start_Talking_full_book_pdf.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> Vimal Patel, “Teaching the Art of the Difficult Classroom Conversation,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 30, 2017, <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Teaching-the-Art-of-the/240784>.

<sup>16</sup> Ximena Zuniga, Biren Nagda, Mark Chesler, and Adena Cryton-Walker, *Intergroup Dialogue in Higher Education: Meaningful Learning About Social Justice* (Wiley 2007).

implemented intergroup dialogue programs. When liberal arts colleges promote intergroup dialogue, they typically offer practicums or courses that facilitate these dialogues through traditional academic departments. These universities could serve as a helpful model if UR wishes to pursue this strategy for facilitating greater intergroup understanding.<sup>17</sup>

### *Recommendations for Promoting More Inclusive and Effective Teaching*

Based on our research, we recommend exploring the following options:

1. The University should take steps to study whether faculty are adopting evidence-based instructional strategies in the classroom. Our concern is that, while the University has adopted several inclusive pedagogy initiatives, it is unknown whether faculty are adopting these methods in the classroom. If it turns out that implementation is weak, it would be useful to know more about why faculty decline to use these strategies.
2. The most straightforward way to incentivize better teaching is for deans and tenure & promotion committees to reward faculty for implementing evidence-based and inclusive practices in their classrooms. These groups should also be educated about the evidence on student evaluations and their biases.
3. Other universities, such as UC Berkeley and the University of Southern California, have reformed their teaching assessment practices to deemphasize student evaluations. USC has implemented a new system that focuses more on peer observation and course-design reviews. Student evaluations are no longer used for individual faculty assessment and instead used as a formative tool.<sup>18</sup> UC Berkeley is moving toward a portfolio system of teaching assessment that also involves peer observation.<sup>19</sup> Both schools are revising their evaluation forms to remove items that require students to make complex judgments about faculty teaching effectiveness, as biases are most likely to affect these answers.
4. The University should take steps to promote a culture of scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). Educational research often suffers from significant problems of external validity. Pedagogical strategies that work well at one institution or with one undergraduate population frequently fail to translate to another university. One way of addressing this problem is to conduct more SoTL at UR. The University should encourage faculty and staff to rigorously evaluate whether their pedagogical techniques are

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://igr.umich.edu/about>

<sup>18</sup> Beckie Supiano, "A University Overhauled Its Course Evaluation to Get Better Feedback. Here's What Changed.," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 29, 2018, <https://www.chronicle.com/article/A-University-Overhauled-Its/243803>.

<sup>19</sup> Philip Stark and Richard Freishtat, "An Evaluation of Course Evaluations," *ScienceOpen Research*, September 29, 2014, <https://doi.org/10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AOFRQA.v1>.

improving learning outcomes. We should make a more systematic effort to test which techniques best promote inclusion and success in the classroom at UR.

5. There is a need for more coordinated support for improving teaching effectiveness at UR. While the University has several inclusive pedagogy initiatives underway, they are fragmented and groups interested in inclusive pedagogy often are operating independently of one another. We are aware of the work of the Teaching and Scholarship Initiative Committee to create a teaching hub that would facilitate cross-campus efforts to promote inclusive pedagogy. At this stage, we support their recommendation to create an Effective and Inclusive Pedagogy Division of a teaching center to coordinate inclusive pedagogy promotion at UR.
6. Many students appear to believe that members of the community who have different political or ideological views do not engage with each other in a respectful manner. Faculty and staff may be able to help model and conduct difficult conversations on controversial topics. However, it is unclear whether faculty and staff have the tools that they need to facilitate these conversations. Other universities have implemented training workshops that teach members of the community how to facilitate difficult debates and discussions. Another potential avenue for improvement is intergroup dialogue programs. There is evidence that these programs promote perspective-taking and positive intergroup perceptions among students. But, to build intergroup dialogue, faculty and staff likely require additional training and support. The University should consider the possibility of integrating an intergroup dialogue program into existing academic departments, and offering facilitator training for intergroup dialogue.

## **Section 2: Anti-Bias & Diversity Training for Faculty and Staff**

Voicing a perspective shared by many UR students, faculty, and staff, Keeling and Associates' final report offered the following recommendation: "Richmond must further empower and support the University community to engage in collegial, constructive, and respectful conversations around issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion on a regular basis... Thoughtful, sustained, deliberative, and civil dialogue on issues of diversity and difference is of paramount importance at Richmond."<sup>20</sup>

To help faculty and staff gain the critical competencies needed to participate in, initiate, and capitalize on such conversations, we recommend that the university make a significant investment in the development and delivery of various "anti-bias" and "diversity" training programs for faculty and staff.

### *Timing and Format*

---

<sup>20</sup> Keeling & Associates (2019). *Making excellence inclusive: Final report for the University of Richmond* (Report No: 1-RCD-201801, page 11.

Such trainings ultimately should be both widely available to all employees (faculty and staff) and targeted toward more specialized groups. For example:

- *New Hires*: Because onboarding and orientation programs provide an early opportunity to set expectations of accepted behavior on campus and to communicate our values, new employees should learn about the university's values of thriving and inclusion prior to arrival on campus and during an orientation period. Currently, all employees receive materials required to begin the employment process. We recommend that materials that orient employees to our values of inclusion and thriving be included. This information may include video clips from the president, students, and employees; e-learning courses; and access to other resources for learning more about our inclusion journey. Additional training may also be required within the first 90 days of employment.
- *Supervisors and Department Chairs*: Unsurprisingly, research suggests that cues taken from leaders may allow prejudice to flourish and undermine efforts to increase diversity.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, supervisors and department chairs are particularly well-positioned to foster or hinder TIDE-related efforts and should receive specialized training in support of these efforts on topics such as fostering inclusive work environments, best practices for recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce, and understanding and addressing bias toward members of stigmatized groups (see below).
- *Faculty*: See section 1 on inclusive pedagogy and intergroup dialogue for training suggestions for faculty.

These professional development opportunities should:

1. be consistently available throughout one's employment at UR;
2. have the potential to be tailored to specific work groups (e.g., the differing needs of dining hall staff vs. Westhampton College Dean's staff vs. faculty) while reflecting our shared values;
3. clearly identify developmental trajectories for increasing one's cultural competence (e.g., both foundational and advanced training opportunities);
4. be encouraged of all employees and perhaps incentivized through performance reviews.

### *Content and Learning Goals*

Empowering UR faculty and staff to work towards promoting a diverse, equitable, inclusive, and thriving community requires that they are provided with opportunities to learn more about

---

<sup>21</sup> Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 81, 72-97. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1999.2867>

Petersen, L. E., & Dietz, J. (2008). Employment discrimination: Authority figures' demographic preferences and followers' affective organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 1287-300. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012867>

Trawalter, S., Driskell, S., & Davidson, M. N. (2015). What is good isn't always fair: On the unintended effects of framing diversity as good. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 16, 69-99. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12103>

barriers to achieving these goals (including bias, stigma, and their consequences), to identify concrete strategies for taking action, and to engage in skills development, all of which should be accomplished through the use of evidence-based practices.

### *Education and Awareness*

One major goal of these anti-bias and diversity trainings should be to educate community members about both individual forms of bias (e.g., implicit bias or microaggressions) and structural or system-level forms of bias. The former category includes subtle acts of discrimination, such as avoiding or distancing oneself from minority group members, making derogatory or insensitive remarks, selectively enforcing policies, and making biased evaluations or judgments.<sup>22</sup> The latter includes environmental factors, such as policies and historical events, that differentially impact minority or stigmatized groups, thereby perpetuating inequality.<sup>23</sup>

Educating and building awareness of these issues is necessary for a variety of reasons. First, members of majority non-marginalized groups often diverge in their knowledge and judgments of bias from members of marginalized groups. For example, subtle acts of bias and discrimination often go undetected by majority of non-marginalized group members, even those who value egalitarianism and multiculturalism.<sup>24</sup> And, recent research demonstrates that they tend to lack critical historical knowledge (i.e., awareness of historical instances of discrimination) and are, therefore, less likely to acknowledge the existence of present-day discrimination.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature, and psychological impact from three daily diary studies. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 31-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00200>

Torres-Harding, S. R., Andrade, A. L., Jr., & Romero, Diaz, C. E. (2012). The Racial Microaggressions Scale (RMAS): A new scale to measure experiences of racial microaggressions in people of color. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18*, 153-164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0027658>

<sup>23</sup> Murphy, M. C. & Walton, G. M. (2013). From prejudiced people to prejudiced places: A social-contextual approach to prejudice. In C. Stangor & C. Crandall (Eds.), *Stereotyping and prejudice* (pp. 181–204). New York: Psychology Press.

<sup>24</sup> Carter, E. R., & Murphy, M. C. (2015). Group-based differences in perceptions of racism: What counts, to whom, and why? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 9*, 269-280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12181>

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62*(4), 271-286. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271>

<sup>25</sup> Bonam, C. M., Das, V. N., Coleman, B. R., & Salter, P. S. (2018). Ignoring history, denying racism: Mounting evidence for the Marley Hypothesis and epistemologies of ignorance. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 10*, 257-265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617751583>

Nelson, J. C., Adams, G., & Salter, P. S. (2013). The Marley Hypothesis: Denial of racism reflects ignorance of history. *Psychological Science, 24*, 213-218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612451466>

Second, these group-based differences in perceptions of bias have important consequences, including less support for policies and actions intended to reduce inequality.<sup>26</sup> Such research findings should not be surprising in that, if an individual is unaware of the conflict between their goal (e.g., egalitarianism) and an outcome (e.g., bias/discrimination), then they are unlikely to make any changes.<sup>27</sup>

Third, by educating about both individual *and* structural forms of bias, these training opportunities may be more successful in ultimately promoting TIDE-related outcomes. For example, research has demonstrated that discussing bias as largely a product of individual minds and behaviors, may actually undermine institutional change efforts aimed at reducing discrimination.<sup>28</sup> By solely identifying “who” is prejudiced, rather than also “what” is prejudiced, individuals may feel both more defensive and less responsible.<sup>29</sup> . Moreover, allies (i.e., those who were not the targets of prejudice but still confronted its existence) were evaluated most favorably by minority group members when they were able to acknowledge discrimination beyond the individual level.<sup>30</sup> Taken together, these findings suggest that programs to increase knowledge of not only individual bias, but also structural bias, may be beneficial both in educating community members *and* in fostering interpersonal dialogue.

### *Concrete Strategies and Skills Development*

Beyond providing knowledge, though, the trainings offered should also include concrete strategies for taking action and opportunities to engage in skills development (e.g., how to go about reducing bias in oneself, supporting diversity and inclusion in one’s work unit, engaging interpersonally with a higher degree of cultural competence, effectively etc.; please also see the recommendations in section 1 on inclusive pedagogy and intergroup dialogue training). Results from one large meta-analysis, involving 260 independent diversity trainings found that, as opposed to trainings that focusing on awareness only, those that also include behavioral

---

<sup>26</sup> Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 532–544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923>  
Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Affirmative action, unintentional racial biases, and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52, 51–75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1996.tb01848.x>

<sup>27</sup> For a review, see Perry, S. P., Murphy, M. C., & Dovidio, J. F. (2015). Modern prejudice: Subtle, but unconscious? The role of bias awareness in whites’ perceptions of personal and others’ biases. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 61, 64-78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.06.007>

<sup>28</sup> Adams, G., Edkins, V., Lacka, D., Pickett, K. M., & Cheryan, S. (2008). Teaching about racism: Pernicious implications of the standard portrayal. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 349–361. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530802502309>

<sup>29</sup> Trawalter, S., & Richeson, J. A. (2008). Let’s talk about race, baby! When Whites’ and Blacks’ interracial contact experiences diverge. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 1214–1217. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.03.013>

<sup>30</sup> Bak, H., & Trawalter, S. (2019, February). “Hey, that’s racist!”: Ingredients for an effective confrontation. Poster presented at the Annual Convention of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Portland, OR.

training tend to be most successful.<sup>31</sup> For example, a gender bias intervention, conducted at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, using a cluster randomized, controlled study targeted at STEM faculty, not only provided examples of stereotype-based gender bias relevant to academic settings, but also five specific behavioral strategies for overcoming gender bias, which participants were encouraged to practice.<sup>32</sup> Results demonstrated that those in academic departments that had participated in the gender bias training (relative to a wait-list control of academic departments that had yet to receive the training) showed increased personal awareness of problematic biases and behaviors, motivation to increase gender equality, and perceptions of the benefits of gender equality. There was evidence that at least some of these benefits persisted during a three month follow up. Importantly, intervention departments also showed an 18 percentage point increase in the proportion of women hired across a two-year period following the intervention workshops, while control departments' hiring of women remained stable over time.<sup>33</sup>

### *The Importance of Using Evidence-Based Practices*

Any implementation of anti-bias and diversity training must rely on evidence-based practices, and their effectiveness on outcomes of interest should be measured. A large body of empirical literature, including the results of various meta-analyses, suggests that such trainings are effective, particularly under some circumstances and for some measurable outcomes.<sup>34</sup> For example, according to the 260-sample meta-analysis mentioned previously: "The positive effects of diversity training were greater when training was complemented by other diversity initiatives, targeted to both awareness and skills development, and conducted over a significant period of time." In making decisions about the particular implementations of anti-bias and diversity training at the University of Richmond, it will be both necessary and beneficial to consult these and other expert sources of evidence.

### *Potential Reservations About Diversity Training*

---

<sup>31</sup> Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical investigation of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *142*, 1227-1274.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/bul0000067>

<sup>32</sup> Molly Carnes et al., "The Effect of an Intervention to Break the Gender Bias Habit for Faculty at One Institution: A Cluster Randomized, Controlled Trial," *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges* *90*, no. 2 (February 2015): 221-30.

<sup>33</sup> Devine, P. G., Forscher, P.S., Cox, W. T. L., Kaatz, A., Sheridan, J., & Carnes, M. (2017). A gender bias habit-breaking intervention led to increased hiring of female faculty in STEM departments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *73*, 211-215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.07.002>

<sup>34</sup> Bezrukova, K., Spell, C. S., Perry, J. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2016). A meta-analytical investigation of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *142*, 1227-1274.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/bul0000067>

Kalinoski, Z. T., Steele-Johnson, D., Peyton, E. J., Leas, K. A., Steinke, J., & Bowling, N. A. (2013). A meta-analytic evaluation of diversity training outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*, 1076-1104.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1839>

Although a clear majority of the committee favor more investment in diversity training, one member of the committee, Javier Hidalgo, has two potential reservations about these trainings. This subsection will briefly explain these reservations.

First, the evidence in favor of diversity training is mixed. Sociologists Frank Dobbin at Harvard University and Alexandra Kalev at Tel Aviv University report the following survey of the evidence:

[T]wo-thirds of human resources specialists report that diversity training does not have positive effects, and several field studies have found no effect of diversity training on women's or minorities' careers or on managerial diversity. These findings are not surprising. There is ample evidence that training alone does not change attitudes or behavior, or not by much and not for long. In their review of 985 studies of antibias interventions, Paluck and Green found little evidence that training reduces bias. In their review of 31 organizational studies using pretest/posttest assessments or a control group, Kulik and Roberson identified 27 that documented improved knowledge of, or attitudes toward, diversity, but most found small, short-term improvements on one or two of the items measured. In their review of 39 similar studies, Bezrukova, Joshi and Jehn identified only five that examined long-term effects on bias, two showing positive effects, two negative, and one no effect.<sup>35</sup>

In addition, Dobbin and Kalev provide other evidence that diversity trainings have minimal long-term impacts. This evidence suggests that we must be realistic about the benefits of diversity training. In light of this evidence, it seems unlikely that a one-off or short-term diversity training will cause durable improvements on its own. The University may instead wish to pursue more long-term and repeated trainings for faculty and staff. However, the benefits of this strategy must be weighed against the time and resources that this investment will require.

The second reservation involves the issue of mandatory or voluntary trainings. If the University wishes to invest more heavily in diversity training, it must decide how to encourage faculty and staff to participate in this training. One option would be to make this training mandatory. Once again, the evidence in favor of mandatory trainings is mixed. One meta-analysis finds that mandatory and voluntary diversity trainings are equally effective.<sup>36</sup> In contrast, other evidence indicates that mandatory diversity trainings can have unintended negative consequences. Faculty and staff may resent mandatory trainings and they can provoke backlashes. A recent survey of the evidence concludes that “people often respond to compulsory courses with anger and resistance—and many participants actually report more animosity toward other groups

---

<sup>35</sup> Frank Dobbin and Alexandra Kalev, “Why Doesn’t Diversity Training Work? The Challenge for Industry and Academia,” *Anthropology Now* 10, no. 2 (May 4, 2018): 48–55, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19428200.2018.1493182>.

<sup>36</sup> Yekaterina Bezrukova et al., “A Meta-Analytical Integration of over 40 Years of Research on Diversity Training Evaluation,” *Academy of Management Proceedings* 2014, no. 1 (January 1, 2014): 14813, <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2014.14813abstract>.

afterward.”<sup>37</sup> Given the mixed evidence on mandatory trainings, the University should be cautious about pursuing this option for faculty and staff.

### **Section 3: Affinity Groups**

Employee Resource Groups, also known as Affinity Groups have existed in the workplace since the 1960s. They bring together employees who share distinctive demographic qualities, interests or professional goals. Initially they focused on demographic similarities but increasingly, organizations are establishing employee resource groups based more broadly defined similarities like elder care or parenting.<sup>38</sup> Often they receive some level of institutional funding and benefit from senior leadership sponsorship. Employee resource groups can contribute to:

- Increasing awareness and inform the institution about workplace trends impacting the group<sup>39</sup>
- Improving retention and developing leadership from and support for underrepresented groups within the university<sup>40</sup>
- Building and sustaining relationships between the University and the larger community through outreach activities
- Assisting with onboarding efforts and initiatives for diverse employees
- Providing opportunities for social events designed to build community among employees from diverse backgrounds
- Providing resources for recruitment, retention, and diversity education on diversity and inclusion issues

Some research indicates that members of resource groups can help new employees acclimate to a new work place. The first three months of employment are an important first step for all new employees and can be even more difficult for members of historically underrepresented groups.<sup>41</sup>

Resource groups can also provide employees from historically underrepresented groups with a safe space to make their voices heard. By coming together in professional and social settings, employees, along with sponsors, advocates, and allies, can discuss how to create short and long-term solutions. We recommend:

---

<sup>37</sup> Frank Dobbin and Alexandra Kalev, “Why Diversity Programs Fail,” *Harvard Business Review*, July 1, 2016, <https://hbr.org/2016/07/why-diversity-programs-fail>.

<sup>38</sup> Center for Women and Business at Bentley University, “Taking Employee Resource Groups to the Next Level,” <https://www.bentley.edu/files/2017/03/17/Bentley%20CWB%20ERG%20Research%20Report%20Fall%202016.pdf>

<sup>39</sup> <https://www.umassmed.edu/dio/engagement/erg/> ERGs can be leveraged to acclimate employees and engender a sense of loyalty and belonging to their new company.

<sup>40</sup> <https://www.diversityinc.com/the-business-benefits-of-employee-resource-groups/>

<sup>41</sup> <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/news/hr-magazine/0916/pages/are-employee-resource-groups-good-for-business.aspx>

1. The creation of a pilot program that supports one or two resource groups with employee populations large enough to test the viability of this model
2. If the pilots are successful, the creation of an infrastructure that makes support, guidelines and executive sponsorship available for the creation of employee resource groups
3. AS part of the structure, resource groups must promote intersectionality, providing opportunities for the majority group to participate.

#### **Section 4: Onboarding and Orientation**

Currently, all employees receive materials required to begin the employment process. It is the first opportunity share our vision and culture. According to Amy Hirsh Robinson, principal of the consulting firm The Interchange Group in Los Angeles, "Onboarding is a magic moment when new employees decide to stay engaged or become disengaged. It offers an imprinting window when you can make an impression that stays with new employees for the duration of their careers."<sup>42</sup>

Research indicates that an effective onboarding program can

- Increase retention<sup>43</sup>
- Reduce the time it takes for employees to acclimate to the organization and their new role
- Increases the likelihood of employee engagement

To be effective, onboarding should not be seen as a one-time event but should continue throughout the first year of employment. It is an important strategic imperative to use this opportunity to introduce the work we have done and will continue to do on making excellence inclusive. This will also set the standards which the University expects of its employees. During the onboarding process for all faculty and staff, we recommend;

- Sending a welcome video of the President, students, faculty/staff talking about our culture and the initiatives around inclusivity
- Providing new employees with a comprehensive list of resources around campus for support and/or programs they may want to become involved in.
- Including a more comprehensive overview of the University's history and the journey to where we are now.
- Requiring all new employees to complete a course (on-line or in-person) within 60 days of hire, focused on the importance of inclusivity and why this is important and valuable to the University and oneself.

---

<sup>42</sup> Hirsch, Arlene, 2017, [Don't Underestimate the Importance of Good Onboarding](https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-acquisition/pages/dont-underestitnate-the-importance-of-effective-onboarding.aspx), <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-acquisition/pages/dont-underestitnate-the-importance-of-effective-onboarding.aspx>

<sup>43</sup> Krasman, M. (2015). [Three must-have onboarding elements for new and relocated employees](https://resowces.urbanbound.com/hubfs/press/prfeatwe-employmentrelationstodayk.rasmanmb15.pdf?t=1459447749532). *Employment Relations Today*, 9-14. doi: 10.1002/ert <https://resowces.urbanbound.com/hubfs/press/prfeatwe-employmentrelationstodayk.rasmanmb15.pdf?t=1459447749532>

## **Section 5: Recruitment**

It is well established that diversity of the faculty and staff is critical to the success of all colleges and universities. While the University has made progress in diversifying faculty and staff populations, there are opportunities to make further progress.

Creating recruiting policies and practices that increase the likelihood of making diverse hires requires the education of managers and leaders in the importance of engaging in the promotion of our diversity initiatives, not just during a recruitment effort but as part of institutional culture. Programs that limit or control manager biases have been shown to have less effect.<sup>44</sup> In order to be most effective, implicit bias training must be combined with other policies and practices that will lead to more effective outcomes.<sup>45</sup> For example, in her research of recruitment at elite employers, Lauren Rivera noted that giving HR and/or diversity staff a stronger voice in the actual hiring process could, “help to legitimize and raise the status of diversity recruitment activities and professionals and increase the likelihood of their success.”<sup>46</sup>

Transparency and consistency in our recruiting practices, articulation of our specific goals, and supervisor and department chair training will help us achieve our stated outcomes. We recommend:

- Faculty and staff search committees and hiring managers receive training prior to the posting of any position vacancy.
- The development of recruiting and selection protocols for all faculty and staff searches with the expectation that they are adhered to, including but not limited to,
  - Evaluating the job description and/or position announcement before it is posted to ensure it has been constructed in a way that will bring in a qualified and diverse pool of candidates.
  - Language used in job descriptions and position announcements should emphasize the University’s commitment to diversity while highlighting the opportunity candidates have to contribute to our thriving and inclusion goals.
  - As a requisite job qualification, a statement must be included in the job description and position announcement that candidates be able to demonstrate job-related experience with and/or commitment to diversity in the work/academic environment.

---

<sup>44</sup> Dobbin, F., Schrage, D., & Kalev, A. (2015). Rage against the Iron Cage: The Varied Effects of Bureaucratic Personnel Reforms on Diversity. *American Sociological Review*, 80(5), 1014-1044. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24756354>

<sup>45</sup> RIVERA, L. (2012). Diversity within Reach: Recruitment versus Hiring in Elite Firms. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 639, 71-90. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41328591>

<sup>46</sup> RIVERA, L. (2012). Diversity within Reach: Recruitment versus Hiring in Elite Firms. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 639, 71-90. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41328591>, page 88

- Drawing upon the work done at other institutions to establish transparent and consistent hiring practices, develop and implement search guidelines to help search committees and hiring units conduct searches that both maximize their ability to establish a diverse and well qualified applicant pool, while complying with University guidelines.<sup>47</sup>
- Search committees should include members with a variety of perspectives and sensitivity to equity and diversity issues.
- Search committees should consider as important selection criteria for all candidates (regardless of their own demographic characteristics), the ability of the candidate both to add intellectual diversity to the department, and to work successfully with diverse students and colleagues.

In addition, we recommend that the university explore the viability of cluster faculty hiring.

Cluster hiring of faculty has become increasingly popular in recent years. This practice entails hiring more than one faculty member in a given specialization, typically within a given hiring cycle.<sup>48</sup> Cluster hiring can occur within one department or across departments and has been adopted by universities such as the UC system as well as the University of Michigan. Perhaps more importantly, cluster hiring—when done correctly—can improve faculty diversity and build on our institution’s excellence by also promoting interdisciplinary collaboration.<sup>49</sup>

First and foremost, cluster hires must be supported at the decanal level and by faculty at all steps in order to be successful. Successful cluster hiring has varied across a variety of factors including: level of hire (this can work at the junior or senior level, depending on the institution’s needs) and funding model (e.g., funding by the provost/chancellor only, funding by the individual school/college only, or a split-funding model divided between those two parties).<sup>50</sup>

This practice is effective in promoting cross-disciplinary collaboration and also diversity. Regarding the former, schools can focus on an exciting new area of scholarly interest and use a cluster hiring strategy to consider the varying perspectives that could contribute to this

---

<sup>47</sup> Several institutions have developed toolkits for faculty searches. Notably, Santa Clara University, <https://www.scu.edu/diversity/inclusive-hiring-and-recruitment/strategies-toolkit/>, The University of Wisconsin-Madison, [https://wiseli.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/662/2018/11/SearchBook\\_Wisc.pdf](https://wiseli.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/662/2018/11/SearchBook_Wisc.pdf); Harvard University, [https://hr.fas.harvard.edu/files/fas-hr/files/recruiting\\_for\\_diversity\\_9.17.13\\_0.pdf](https://hr.fas.harvard.edu/files/fas-hr/files/recruiting_for_diversity_9.17.13_0.pdf) and The University of Texas at Austin, [http://equity.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/OIE-Recruitment\\_Sept2016\\_v\\_1.2.pdf](http://equity.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/OIE-Recruitment_Sept2016_v_1.2.pdf)

<sup>48</sup> <https://www.vanderbilt.edu/provost/resources-faculty/University-of-Michigan-Faculty-Recruitment-Handbook.pdf>

<sup>49</sup> <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/05/01/new-report-says-cluster-hiring-can-lead-increased-faculty-diversity>. Because the practice of cluster hiring is relatively new, there is, admittedly, not much systematic evidence (i.e., replicated randomized control trials) studying its effectiveness. Much of the information here is based on a report from the Coalition for Urban Serving Universities, the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, and the Association of American Medical College.

<sup>50</sup> <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/05/01/new-report-says-cluster-hiring-can-lead-increased-faculty-diversity>

substantive area. The university's efforts surrounding data science might benefit from this suggested practice in particular, as this focus is inherently multi-disciplinary.<sup>51</sup>

Regarding the improvement of diverse faculty, cluster hiring tends to increase diversity among historically underrepresented groups—particularly when partnered with other recruitment strategies that promote diversity. UC Berkeley suggests grouping hiring efforts together rather than conducting searches sequentially. Doing so prevents rigid, narrow (sub-) disciplinary definitions from systematically excluding certain candidates.<sup>52</sup> Further, cluster hires help with the retention of historically underrepresented groups,<sup>53</sup> as junior faculty enter into the university with a cohort of peers who they can both collaborate with academically and support professionally.

### **Section 6: Supervisor and Department Chairs Training**

Employee engagement research consistently shows that supervisors have a significant impact on employee engagement and work place culture.<sup>54</sup> Specifically, when it comes to creating inclusive workplaces, the supervisor sets expectations and models behavior.

The University has participated in the Great Colleges to Work<sup>55</sup> for survey four times since 2010. In each of those our results are lower in the areas that are most likely to be impacted directly by supervisor attitudes and behaviors, “Communication,” “Collaboration,” “Fairness” and “Respect and Appreciation.” Some examples, with positive response rates are:

- Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented. 47%
- At this institution, we discuss and debate issues respectfully to get better results. 59%
- We have opportunities to contribute to important decisions in my department. 63%
- I can count on people to cooperate across departments. 56%
- There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution. 55%
- I can speak up or challenge a traditional way of doing something without fear of harming my career 60%
- This institution's policies and practices ensure fair treatment for faculty, administration and staff. 60%

All of these responses fall into the “Warning” category in the survey scoring methodology and all of them are influenced by the environment supervisors create.

---

<sup>51</sup> For instance, Vanderbilt is currently in the midst of a multi-year hiring initiative in data sciences, and recently advertised for a political scientist who could contribute to their newly established Data Science Institute.

<sup>52</sup> <https://ofew.berkeley.edu/recruitment/senate-searches/introduction-and-purpose/developing-faculty-recruitment-proposals>

<sup>53</sup> <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/05/01/new-report-says-cluster-hiring-can-lead-increased-faculty-diversity>

<sup>54</sup> <https://getlighthou se.com/blog/gallup-employee-engagement- survey-managers />

<sup>55</sup> 2018, Great Colleges to Work For, in collaboration with Modern Think and the Chronicle of Higher Education. © 2018 ModernThink LLC. All rights reserved.

In 2018, seven custom statements were added to the survey, four of which were designed specifically to capture employee attitudes toward diversity and inclusion. They were, with positive response rates:

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. The institution supports a work environment where everyone is entitled to dignity and respect, regardless of race, color, religion, age, disability, ethnicity, sexual orientation or gender identity | 84% |
| 2. We are making effective strides in becoming a more diverse and inclusive institution  | 83% |
| 3. My department supports a work environment where employees feel comfortable expressing different opinions, styles, and beliefs regardless of titles or position  | 66% |
| 4. This institution values my contribution   | 66% |

All of these responses fall into the “good to excellent” category. Overall, employees report that they believe the university is moving in the right direction. However, the response for the third statement indicates that, supervisors and department chairs can do a better job of creating an environment where everyone is respected and valued. The last two statements align with others in the survey.

Changing the university culture around inclusion will require supervisors to develop new skills and competencies. Providing robust and relevant training equips managers with the knowledge, skills, and abilities to effectively model the appropriate values of a thriving and inclusive community.<sup>56</sup> We recommend:

- Continuation of the currently required two-day supervisor orientation program, completed by all new supervisors with the first 90 days of employment or promotion
- Building from the pilot supervisor development cohort program formalize a supervisor development program that includes training in performance management, understanding and managing personal bias, conflict management, best practices in recruiting and hiring a diverse workforce, communication skills and developing employee recognition programs.
- These training opportunities should be available throughout the year
- The training should allow time for skill building and practicing.

### Summary

The recommendations of the Faculty and Staff Development cover several different but related areas for skill development and support for faculty and staff in and outside the classroom. Work is already in progress on several of our recommendations, particularly as it relates to inclusive pedagogy. Human Resources provides onboarding and orientation for all faculty and staff and each school provides an orientation for new faculty during the fall. These programs

---

<sup>56</sup> <https://getlighthouse.com/blog/people-leave-managers-not-companies/>

are effective but can benefit from a more consistent integration and the addition of diversity and inclusion orientations for all employees.

Resources are available to support more inclusive recruiting and hiring practices but these are accessed and applied inconsistently across campus in searches for faculty and staff. Developing standards and setting expectations for more inclusive recruiting practices will increase the likelihood for making diverse hires.

Educating faculty and staff about both individual *and* structural forms of bias through the design and delivery of evidence based anti-bias and diversity training will provide employees with the awareness and skill to promote a diverse, equitable, inclusive, and thriving community.

Supervisors and department chairs are well-positioned to foster or hinder TIDE-related efforts and, in addition to training that develops their communication and leadership skills, should receive specialized training in support of diversity efforts on topics such as fostering inclusive work environments, best practices for recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce, and understanding and addressing bias toward members of stigmatized groups

The establishment of employee resource groups (affinity groups) will provide faculty and staff similar interests or demographic backgrounds with opportunities to engage professionally and socially. These groups will also be able to provide educational opportunities for other community members.

We acknowledge that these recommendations and training efforts reflect a multi-year effort. While there is research suggesting that short term or one-time anti bias interventions can be unsuccessful, we believe that with a sustained commitment and continued reinforcement of these recommendations that we can create a thriving campus community.