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Equity, Diversity and Excellence Initiative (EDEI)

- Main premise: Hiring and retaining a world-class faculty requires
  - fostering a diverse pool of talent;
  - creating an inclusive and equitable work climate;
  - supporting the career growth of existing faculty
  - customizing to each college

- Emphasizes institutional support through 4 elements:
  - Faculty development and leadership training
  - Transparency
  - Bias awareness and promoting a culture of equity
  - Data-based decision making and accountability
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND LEADERSHIP TRAINING
There are a Collection of Efforts on Training and Development

ADVANCE
- “Adaptive Leadership Strategies” by Nancy Houfek

COLLEGES & SCHOOLS
- Structured mentoring is becoming more widespread (e.g., some CoS schools, CoA)
- IAC Leadership and Success Lunch Series

ILE
- Leadership Roundtables
- Development retreat for newly tenured faculty
ADVANCE Proposes to Pilot Institute-Wide Leadership Program

- Climate survey
  - Mid-career faculty are the least satisfied
  - Mentoring for career advancement and leadership positions: 59% of faculty rate 3 or 4

- There is no ongoing leadership development program

- Room for growth in women in leadership and administrative roles (in some colleges)

- Proposed idea:
  - Locally designed/sourced
  - 4 short sessions per year for each cohort; network over time
  - Priority to women and URM
Workshop on “Implicit Associations and Decision Making” is in Progress

- **The Need**
  - Awareness on implicit associations and their impact on decision making
  - Adoption of strategies to combat

- **Faculty Workshop**
  - Under development by Dr. Julie Ancis, Associate VPID, with input from ADVANCE Professors and advisory faculty group

- **Next Steps**
  - Revise workshop based on feedback
  - Roll out, assess, revise (continuous improvement)
    - CoA – mandatory for all school chairs, hiring and RP&T committees
EQUITY
Leadership Commitment to a Culture that Values Diversity and Equity is key

- The Need
  - All leadership and rank-and-file to exhibit a visible commitment to these values

- Examples in Excellence
  - Deans and/or Chairs inquiring about diversity of candidate/interviewee pool
  - Salary survey – COE
  - Multi-year analysis of data for trends in RPT rates at each level, by gender – COE
    - Notable difference in third-year review

- Recommendation
  - Roll out to all Colleges; communicate how raise structure accommodates “equity” adjustments
Transparency is Valuable in Achieving Equity

- The Need: Ensure transparency in more procedures/resources to avoid reliance on being “in-network” for knowledge/access
- Examples in Excellence:
  - CoS: Mentoring program details, ASMD procedures, faculty leave procedures, etc. are posted on College website
  - IAC: School Handbooks for Clarity and Continuity in Guidelines and Practices of Schools (tenure and promotion processes, search and hiring of faculty, mentoring, and other areas).
- Recommendation: Roll out to all Schools and Colleges
INCLUSION (AND PERCEPTIONS OF INCLUSION)
GT Climate Survey


- Treasure trove of information
  - Raw data available from Office of Assessment for Colleges to analyze

- Will be repeated in a couple of years; creating an opportunity to track progress over time
Even in positive climates, men and women inhabit two parallel worlds

“Georgia Tech is generally a comfortable and inclusive environment for me”

Scheller College data; GT overall: 87%(M) vs. 72%(W), 84% vs. 76% (URM) rate 3-4
Even in positive climates, men and women inhabit two parallel worlds.

“In my school/academic unit: My feedback is sought and respected”

Scheller College data; no breakdown by gender or URM status in GT Climate Report
“Diversity is integral to Georgia Tech’s ability to successfully fulfill its mission”

*Scheller College data; GT overall: 89% rate 3-4; breakdown by gender/URM not reported
Perception of commitment to diversity and inclusion differs by gender

“My school/unit demonstrates its **commitment to diversity and inclusion**”

*Scheller College data; GT overall 89% vs. 66% rate 3-4*
Perception of commitment to diversity and inclusion differs by gender

“I am satisfied with my school’s/department’s efforts to recruit faculty from diverse backgrounds”

Scheller College data; GT overall not presented by gender in GT Climate report
Inclusion can be Enhanced in Many Ways

- The Need
  - Climate data shows there is room for improvement

- Examples in Excellence
  - Include diversity and inclusion as a strategic plan goal
    - CoA Strategic Plan Goal 4: “Cultivate College diversity, equity, and inclusion”
    - Scheller Strategic Plan Goal 4: “Foster a diverse, inclusive, vibrant, and innovative community of students, faculty, staff, and alumni”
  - Georgia Tech Strategic Plan: one sentence in “Planning Context” section (“leverage diversity”, “culture of collegiality”, “intercultural sensitivity and respect”)
Inclusion can be Enhanced in Many Ways

- Examples in Excellence (cont.)
  - Include diversity and inclusion as a strategic plan goal
  - Web highlights of research by women faculty – CoE, IAC
  - Coordinated, proactive nominations of women and URM for important committees, symposia, etc. - CoE
  - Hiring toolkit/guidelines – CoA, CoE, CoS, IAC
  - Diversity Council - CoS

- Recommendations
  - Review schools’ strategic plan goals as they are defined
  - Roll out similar approaches to all Colleges
Recommendations

- Use Climate Survey as an ongoing assessment and continuous improvement tool – aim for progress in all Colleges and constituencies by 2016/17
- Visible and transparent efforts for enhancing diversity and inclusion are very important
  - All of the above +
  - Maintaining and expanding Target-of-Opportunity and dual hiring
DATA-BASED DECISION MAKING AND ACCOUNTABILITY
There is Room for Growth in Chairs Held by Female Full Professors

Distribution of Chairs by College

- College of Computing: 6 chairs
- College of Engineering: 77 chairs
- College of Sciences: 15 chairs
- College of Architecture: 4 chairs
- Ivan Allen College: 5 chairs
- Scheller College: 15 chairs

Legend:
- Blue: % of Chairs held by men
- Orange: % Chairs held by women
- Gray: % Chairs vacant
There is Room for Growth in Chairs Held by Female Full Professors

% Chairholders (at Full level) by Gender

College of Sciences: 14% Male, 0% Female
College of Engineering: 28% Male, 20% Female
College of Computing: 15% Male, 0% Female

- % of Male Full Professors who hold Chairs
- % of Female Full Professors who hold Chairs
Some Colleges have Parity or More

% Chairholders by Gender

- Scheller College: 83% Male, 33% Female
- Ivan Allen College: 10% Male, 11% Female
- College of Architecture: 15% Male, 25% Female

% of Male Full Professors who hold Chairs
% of Female Full Professors who hold Chairs
Recommendations: Chairs and Professorships

- Recommendations
  - Be attuned to implicit association and network effects in internal decisions
  - Where chairs are used for recruiting, purpose matters
  - Analyze data on “pipeline” – Professorships, Deans’ Professorships, Distinguished Professorships
Use Data to Identify Trends and Fixable Leaks in the Hiring and P&T Pipeline

- **Approach:** Start “at source” and track conversions
- 2014/15 - Collected data on Interviews → Offers → Acceptances by College

### Assistant Professor data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of candidates interviewed for</th>
<th># of offers given</th>
<th># of offers accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women (37%) 147</td>
<td>Women (32%) 25</td>
<td>Women (68%) 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (63%) 85</td>
<td>Men (68%) 52</td>
<td>Men (32%) 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Only one year of data, as reported from Colleges ***
Examples: CoS and Ivan Allen
Strong representation of women in the interviewee pool

College of Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of candidates interviewed</th>
<th># of offers given</th>
<th># of offers accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men (24/48)</td>
<td>Men (11/48)</td>
<td>Men (1/14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ivan Allan College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of candidates interviewed</th>
<th># of offers given</th>
<th># of offers accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women (24/50)</td>
<td>Women (9/75)</td>
<td>Women (3/100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assistant Professor data

*** Only one year of data
Example: CoE
Relatively low interview→offer and offer→accept for women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of candidates interviewed for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assistant Professor data

Pipeline: Doctoral degrees awarded to women in the United States (2014)
- >50% overall
- >22% in engineering

*** Only one year of data
### Examples: Scheller and CoC

Relatively low interview→accept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College of Business</th>
<th>College of Computing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong># of candidates interviewed</strong></td>
<td># of offers given</td>
<td># of offers accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of offers given</strong></td>
<td># of offers accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of offers accepted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assistant Professor data

*** Only one year of data
Use Data to Identify Trends and Fixable Leaks in the Hiring and P&T Pipeline

Recommendations

- Structured “exit” interviews, including departures
- Colleges undertake a multi-year analysis of data (by gender) for trends in
  - Interviews, offers, accept/reject
  - RPT rates at each level
Potential for increased gender diversity in lateral hires

### Associate Professor

- **# of candidates interviewed for**
  - Women: 8 (22%)
  - Men: 28 (78%)
  - Total: 36

- **# of offers given**
  - Women: 1 (10%)
  - Men: 9 (90%)
  - Total: 10

- **# of offers accepted**
  - Women: 1 (100%)
  - Men: 1 (10%)
  - Total: 2

### Full Professor

- **# of candidates interviewed for**
  - Women: 8 (23%)
  - Men: 27 (77%)
  - Total: 35

- **# of offers given**
  - Women: 3 (20%)
  - Men: 12 (80%)
  - Total: 15

- **# of offers accepted**
  - Women: 2 (67%)
  - Men: 7 (78%)
  - Total: 9

Potential for increased gender diversity in lateral hires.
SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

■ ADVANCE + Partners:
  ■ Centrally-run data gathering, in part from existing databases
    ■ In the meantime, continue collecting and analyzing data from Deans’ reports
  ■ Pilot leadership development program for mid-level/senior faculty
  ■ Develop structured exit interviews and pilot implementation
  ■ On the horizon: Additional surveys and activities on understanding and improving the “climate”
ADMINISTRATION:

- Use the climate survey as a periodic assessment and continuous improvement tool.
- Expand scope of transparency and equitable processes/resource allocation in all schools and colleges.
- Take every opportunity to enhance inclusion and perceptions of inclusion.
- Increased support for opportunity or dual career hires; more attention to lateral hires.