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“There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things.”

- Niccolo Machiavelli, 
The Prince
Learning Objectives

1. Describe the imperatives driving the diversification of our faculty workforce.
2. Understand the impact of unconscious bias in the screening and search process.
3. Discuss the common pitfalls associated with biased search processes and how to avoid them.
4. Describe how you can enhance your search process.
Ground Rules

• Stay engaged
• Confidentiality
• Respectful communication
• Honest and open discussion
• No judgments
• Listen with the intent of being influenced
Self & Group Assessment – Search Committees

• Experiences?
• ‘Good’ search processes?
• ‘Bad’ search processes?
• What barriers and/or challenges do you anticipate?
Imperatives Driving Diversity

Demographics of Counties Served
“UCDHS defines diversity as being representative of the demographic profiles of the communities that surround us for whom we serve. This definition is not limited to those that are underrepresented in medicine. However, UCDHS is cognizant of population groups that are underrepresented in the health care fields, and has developed a number of activities/programs in the recruitment and advancement of students, faculty and staff belonging to these specific groups, e.g. African American, Hispanic, Native Americans, Hmong, Pacific Islanders, Vietnamese, LGBTQ, veterans, and people living with disabilities.”
| Race/Ethnicity                  | Placer County | SAC County | Yolo County | Amador County | Contra Costa | El Dorado County | San Joaquin | Solano County | Sutter County | Napa County | Nevada County | Sierrra County | Yuba County | Regional Total |
|--------------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| White                          | 78.55%        | 53.51%     | 54.38%      | 87.63%        | 51.21%       | 81.78%          | 40.43%      | 44.50%        | 54.16%        | 59.33%      | 68.26%        | 93.24%         | 61.71%      | 54.73%       |
| Black or African American      | 1.31%         | 9.02%      | 2.15%       | 0.15%         | 8.47%        | 0.72%           | 6.43%       | 13.03%        | 1.88%         | 1.51%       | 0.35%         | 1.13%          | 2.33%       | 7.01%        |
| All Asians                     | 6.05%         | 14.99%     | 12.16%      | 1.73%         | 15.30%       | 3.70%           | 14.50%      | 16.53%        | 14.08%        | 6.98%       | 1.18%         | 0.23%          | 6.70%       | 13.14%       |
| American Indian and Alaska Nat | 0.70%         | 0.59%      | 0.81%       | 1.11%         | 0.28%        | 0.67%           | 0.46%       | 0.39%         | 0.34%         | 0.40%       | 0.74%         | 0.00%          | 1.20%       | 0.51%        |
| Other and/or Two+ Races        | 1.91%         | 3.11%      | 2.56%       | 2.37%         | 2.70%        | 2.37%           | 2.55%       | 4.02%         | 3.30%         | 1.82%       | 1.97%         | 0.00%          | 4.58%       | 2.82%        |
| Hispanic or Latino             | 11.59%        | 18.77%     | 28.14%      | 6.80%         | 22.04%       | 10.76%          | 35.63%      | 21.56%        | 25.95%        | 30.14%      | 7.56%         | 6.25%          | 23.49%      | 21.79%       |
| **Total Population**           | **157,890**   | **697,365** | **99,255**  | **16,170**    | **526,155**  | **92,460**      | **309,840** | **204,555**   | **44,065**    | **68,985**  | **49,055**    | **1,775**      | **30,650**  | **2,308,230** |

Source: www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/; Civilian Labor Force (> or = 16 years of age); California Department of Finance, EEO Data
Imperatives Driving Diversity

Demographics of UC Faculty
Table 7 • Representation of Women and Minority Representation at UC Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AfrAm</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chic/Lat</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UC Faculty Composition 1989-2005, 2013
Percentage of URM Faculty by Campus

Table 19 • Percentage URM Faculty by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UC Davis School of Medicine

### Overall Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Hires</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Faculty</strong></td>
<td><strong>804</strong></td>
<td><strong>858</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can we keep recruiting the way we are now?

Table 40 • Underrepresented Minority Faculty as a Percent of All UC Faculty
Actual and Future Projections Comparing 1996 Hiring to 2004 Hiring Patterns

- Hiring URM at 1996 rate of 6%
- Hiring URM at 2004 rate of 11%
- Hiring URM at 2004 rate of 11% and correcting separation disparities
Imperatives Driving Diversity

Accreditation, Regulations & Mandates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Standards, Regulations and Other Imperatives Driving Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LCME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACGME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JCAHO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California &amp; UC Davis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“People generally only see what they look for, and only hear what they listen for.”

- Harper Lee
Effects of Unconscious Bias?

- Clinical (health care disparities)
- Hiring (affects diversity)
- Promotion (career advancement)
- Curriculum design/content (what is left out?)
- Admissions (diversity)
- Committee assignments (organizational decisions and policy)
- Grant review process
- Peer review decisions
Exercise #1

Interrupting Bias in Faculty Search Process

University of Washington, Center for Institutional Change
Exercise #1 - Discussion

• What did you notice?
  • Any privileges? Biases? Shortcuts?

• What might be motivating each of the characters’ behaviors?

• What would you do differently?
  • How would you interrupt the behavior?
Common Shortcuts (Pitfalls, Cognitive Errors)

- Cloning
- Snap judgments
- Negative stereotypes
- Positive stereotypes
- Elitism
- Wishful thinking

- Good fit – Bad fit
- Euphemized bias
  - Visionary
  - Star
  - Committed
  - Single-minded
  - Hard worker

University of Washington, Center for Institutional Change
Responsibilities of the Search Committee Member

• Working collaboratively with search committee chair to establish processes and ground rules
• Conducting an inclusive and unbiased review of applicants – in order to ensure qualified women and minorities are well represented in the applicant and interview pool
• Maintaining a pattern of mutual respect in all deliberations
• Maintain positive interactions with candidates
“The significant problems we face cannot be solved at the same level of thinking we were at when we created them.”

- Albert Einstein
Ground Rules for Search Committees
*(Faculty Diversity: Removing the Barriers, 2nd Ed., Joann Moody)*

1. Concentrate on rising above cognitive biases & errors in your discussions.
2. Adhere to the weighting of each job category.
3. Attendance at each search committee meeting will be the norm.
4. Present & consider concrete evidence, not personal opinion or hearsay about job candidates.
5. Guarantee strict confidentiality regarding job candidates, discussions, deliberations…
6. Decide how the committee will come to decisions during various stages of the work.
7. Undertake outreach to build up the pool of candidates...
8. All members will have more or less equal “air time” during committee deliberations.
9. Agree to treat every job applicant with respect.
10. Use same list of questions for every applicant.
11. Bring up institution’s willingness to provide assistance to spouses/significant others....
Online Resources

• UC Davis School of Medicine Academic Personnel
  http://www.ucdmc.ucdavis.edu/academicpersonnel/

• Academic Personnel (AP) Training Information
  http://www.ucdmc.ucdavis.edu/academicpersonnel/ap_training_info_2013.08.html

• UC Davis Academic Affairs Faculty Search Committee Workshop 2013: Resources Package
Questions??
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