

2017 REPORT FOR THE DEAN OF FAS
from
THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR DIVERSITY AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

We submit this report as an update on the efforts of the Advisory Committee for Diversity and Faculty Development in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Yale University. Chaired by the interim Deputy Dean for Diversity and Faculty Development, this committee has met on a monthly basis in 2016-17 to develop an agenda for diversity within the FAS and University-wide faculties (UWF) as well as institutional practices consonant with that agenda.

The work of the Advisory Committee for Diversity and Faculty Development must be understood in its longer historical context. This committee formed in response to student and faculty protests in fall 2015. But the work of this committee exists in the wake of many reports, written by many committees, over many years. This includes twenty-eight reports on diversity between 1972-2016, including the 1975 Report of the Faculty Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, the 1976 Report on Affirmative Action in the Physical Sciences, the 1976 Reports of the Faculty Study Groups on the Recruitment and Appointment of Women and Minority Faculty, the 1989 Rodin Report, the 1984 Report of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences Advisory Committee on the Education of Women, the 1991 Jaynes Report, the 1993 Berson Report, the 2002 and 2012 Women Faculty Forum Reports, the 2014 Faculty Diversity Hiring Committee, the 2014 Diversity Summit Report, and the 2016 FAS Senate Report.¹

These twenty-eight reports do not have divergent findings. They repeat the same imperatives, over and over: the demographics for diversity at Yale University are abysmal. To resolve the problem, the University must commit to the recruitment of underrepresented minorities. But, as the reports repeat, this is not enough. Sustainable change requires that we diversify our university in the deepest sense, adopting practices of inclusion that set the highest expectations for equal opportunity. We must rebuild our foundational structures so as to acknowledge the exclusionary effects of our enterprise. We must build new frameworks of access so as to change the demographics of our community, and, along the way, alter the ways we engage as researchers, teachers, and colleagues. We use the repeated statistical realization of these reports as a call to change not only numbers, but also ourselves.

The 2016-17 advisory committee knew these reports had been issued. They also knew that these reports had not led to substantive changes in the institution. This precedent weighed heavily upon our collective reflections.

“We need to recognize that even the words we use can be ways of not doing things,” Sara Ahmed has written in a 2016 essay on diversity in higher education. “We learn that even when nothing happens, nothing changes, a lot work is going on; a lot of effort, the effort to change something, the effort not to be changed by something.” At Yale, within the FAS and beyond, “diversity” has become a requisite keyword for every administrative utterance. No one could deny that there is therefore the representation of a commitment to diversity. There is however no apparent evidence that there is a substantive commitment to structuring a truly inclusive university in which diversity is an axiomatic supposition and not a constant argument, an argument that requires seemingly endless acts of individual persuasion, collective engagement, administrative frustration, committee formation, and report authorship. As Ahmed observes, *institutions use words as a way of not doing things.*²

How can we hope to do something, given the precedent of not doing things? How to write another report in the shadow of these previous reports?

¹ The history of diversity initiatives at Yale is described in pages 14-22 of the 2016 FAS Senate [Report](#). In a fall 2016 course, Yale College student Charlotte Weiner conducted research in Yale Manuscripts and Archives and found the twenty-eight reports here cited. Her paper, “An Imperative to Act: The Promises and Practices of Faculty Diversity and Developmental Learning at Yale University,” was written for EDST 210, “Theory and Practice in American Education.”

² Sara Ahmed, “How Not to Do Things with Words,” *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women’s and Gender Studies*, 2016, [vol.16](#), pp. 1-10.

There is no time like the present to refuse the habits of the past and commit to a new understanding of our past, present, and future institutional imperatives. For nearly a half century, Yale College, Graduate, and professional schools have been enrolling a more diverse student body, bringing more women, people of color, and first-generation students into our classrooms and laboratories. It is essential that those students—indeed, *all* Yale students—find a diverse faculty to work with and learn from. Put another way, Yale needs to diversify its faculty with the same purpose, persistence, and innovation that it has put into recruiting its undergraduates. If it continues to stall its faculty development any further in this way, Yale risks losing ground on those disciplinary fronts where scholars are forging those areas of research and teaching that are shaping twenty-first century liberal arts education and global innovation.

To meet this challenge squarely requires bold, direct policies and leadership whose outcomes are measurable and accountable. We recommend the following principles and steps:

SUSTAINABILITY AND CONTINUITY

- We ask that our Provost and President make a definitive promise regarding the duration of Faculty Excellence and Diversity Initiative resources. There can be no meaningful planning without a guarantee of commitment that insures the sustainability and continuity of our diversity efforts.
- The Advisory Committee believes that no leader within the University should be renewed in their appointment or appointed initially without a strong demonstrated record in diversity and faculty development. No new leader should be appointed, nor should someone have their contract extended or service term renewed, if they have not indicated by action their uncompromising commitment to the thriving of women, faculty of color, and underrepresented groups. We ask that every leader be also regularly evaluated by their Deans as well as by the faculty with regard to their work on improving diversity among the faculty and for fostering a climate that encourages the thriving of women, faculty of color, and underrepresented groups.

DECANAL POWERS

- The Deputy Dean of Diversity and Faculty Development (DDDD) must be retitled as a Dean of Diversity and Faculty Development (DDFD). Equality of this dean with other deans within the Office of the Dean of FAS, and other Deans University-wide faculties (UWF), is critical to the new position's success.
- This committee's strong recommendation is that the DDFD is a full-time administrative role occupied by a tenured member of the faculty. If a tenured member of the current faculty cannot be identified, a search firm with a record of success in diversity must be employed to identify a faculty member with administrative capacities for this role.
- Continue to underline that diversity is a presumption in the annual call for pool search requests. This coordinates with the solicitation for 2017-18 searches, in which there is a promise of 10-12 pool (P) slots that year available across the FAS (the annual number available is imagined to be around this number). As that solicitation reads, "these pool slots (typically allocated in half-slot increments) have been specifically allocated for appointments that add excellence and diversity to our faculty. Proposals to use these slots should emphasize how the search will support overall academic excellence, including new academic fields of inquiry, spousal initiatives, areas of intense teaching need, interdisciplinary academic activity, and targets of opportunity." If a search is approved in an area that is expected to bring excellence or strength in an academic area without bringing diversity, the Faculty Resource Committee must ask whether this need is sufficiently urgent to compensate for their perpetuation of our homogeneity. The answer may sometimes be "yes." But this should be the exception, and not the rule.

- The DDFD must act with parity to the FAS divisional deans in their efforts to facilitate hiring in unique areas. Part of such parity includes the DDFD being empowered to propose recruitment of faculty with a thoroughgoing understanding of the slot resources, departmental and pool, in the FAS. At UCLA, the equity offer has a certain allotment of slot resources under their direct control. Given the structure of governance that includes the Faculty Resource Committee, we call upon the Dean of FAS to recognize that the DDFD cannot function with significance in this bureaucratic mechanism without equitable authority to introduce uses of slot resources in the same manner as the divisional deans.
- The DDFD or a nominated representative from their office must serve on all TAC committees. Alternatively, substantive diversity officers must be trained to sit on each TAC. Although this recommendation pertains specifically to the FAS, the Advisory Committee believes this should be a practice required across the University.
- Insofar as search requests are approved by the TACs, the DDFD will participate from the very beginning in the search process, intervening in requests that do not indicate an investment in recruiting as broad a pool as possible, as well as innovating the search terms in such a way as to solicit applications from individuals working in innovative fields of inquiry.
- The DDFD must be able to reject the Interview Approval Form if it fails to reflect the best practices for soliciting diversity.
- The DDFD should dedicate resources for faculty development targeted to pre-tenure women, faculty of color, and underrepresented groups, and should collaborate with chairs to map pre-tenure mentoring as a part of ongoing retention.
- The mission of the FAS is tied to the mission of the GSAS and YCDO. To that end, thoughtful and mutually beneficial coordination between these units, as well as between the Provost's office and the diversity officers in the professional schools, must be a priority.
- The DDFD must serve as a leader in the effort to foster an inclusive and equitable environment for nonladder faculty, postdoctoral researchers, and graduate students.
- The DDFD should provide an annual report providing an account of their progress. This would include developing over time clear benchmarks for success and progress as well as a well-articulated plan for using multiple quantitative and qualitative methods to measure progress. Staff support for the production of such a report will be imperative (*see below*).

DIVERSITY IN THE FAS AND UWF

- Every department and program will be expected to produce a diversity audit that maps their present and future relationship to the goal of diversifying the University.
- The DDFD and the Dean of FAS must coordinate and standardize use of the President's Diversity Initiative through coordination with the Provost's Office.
- The DDFD and the divisional deans must recommend the use of Diversity Initiative resources for recruitments in every department and program. Diverse hiring should not be outsourced to the pool. This creates cynical incentives and does not promote structural change.

- Departments and programs that have used pool slots to recruit diversity and have demonstrated success at the development of their areas of inquiry should be allowed to petition the Faculty Resource Committee to convert pool slots into departmental slots in order to make possible long-term planning for the unit.
- Departments and programs with a strong record of recruitment, mentoring, promotion, and retention of women, faculty of color, and underrepresented groups should be given preference in requests for positions. Those programs that have not demonstrated such commitment would be subject to additional consultation with the DDFD before receiving additional resources to recruit. Department must invest investment in the future of what the world's top universities, including ours, will look like in the twenty-first century. Departments should not be given resources to perpetuate the status quo.
- Postdoctoral fellowships should be established in research areas of potential growth and development. We specifically recommend 2-3 year postdoctoral fellowships for diversity with the potential to develop them into ladder faculty positions. These should have a competitive application process akin to similar programs at the University of Chicago, Michigan, and the UC system.
- Intellectual diversity must be integrated into the tenure and promotion processes. All external reviewers should be subject to the same expectations as those we seek to apply to hiring. Divisional deans should encourage reviewers from a wide range of intellectual and institutional perspectives.
- The Office of the Dean of FAS and the DDFD should collaborate to develop post-tenure special triennial leave or its equivalent for superlative faculty citizens. Diversity should be a critical consideration in the selection process.
- Tracking service among ladder faculty is especially imperative in the retention and evaluation of those faculty members. The deans in the FAS must acknowledge that there are disproportionate effects of service on ladder women, faculty of color, and underrepresented groups. Developing a system of quantitative metrics for service hours is highly recommended, and indeed might make it easier to retain faculty diversity.
- All candidates for ladder and non-ladder faculty as well as leadership positions, in addition to their CVs, research and teaching statements, and letters of reference, must submit a statement on diversity in which they outline their past experience, successes, and challenges in diversity efforts.
- The DDFD, in collaboration with current administrators, should review institutional FAS policies under the lens of equity and inclusion to ensure that structural barriers are eliminated or mitigated.
- Recognizing that we work in complex, heterogeneous communities that are global in nature, the DDFD will support training opportunities designed to create climates of transparency and trust that value and support the distinctive contributions and abilities of that community's members. Transparent decision-making facilitates equitable communities.

WHOLE FAMILY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

- There must be a university-wide effort to coordinate resources on behalf of spousal appointments, parental leave, child development and education, eldercare, and housing benefits. Some unpartnered faculty face difficult resource questions as well and this too should be taken into consideration.
- The Office of the Dean of FAS must establish a program for shared ownership of spousal faculty recruitment.

- The Office of the Dean of FAS must continue to demonstrate why significant revisions to the parental leave policy are essential in order to retain excellent faculty. The revisions suggested are those recommended in the 2016 FAS Senate Report.
- Yale University should expand the geography for housing support, mirroring Columbia's model in which they supply a particular stipend for housing without tying it to a particular region.

STAFFING

- The Office of the Dean of FAS must install a diversity professional (M&P) with several charges including: the organization and management of a post-baccalaureate program; whole family recruitment and lifecycle mentoring; faculty development; and the development, coordination, and advancement of transparent, inclusive diversity and excellence initiatives, programs, and policies. The Office of the Dean of FAS will be unable to recruit a DDFD without such quantitative support of new initiatives as well as substantive, ongoing data collection to illustrate the effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of their efforts.

This report reflects our strongest considered and collective opinion on the terms that should define the work of the Dean of Diversity and Faculty Development in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Yale University. We welcome further consultation with the Office of General as well as the cognizant Deans to ensure that these recommendations comply with applicable law.

Submitted on March 10, 2017 by the Advisory Committee for Diversity and Faculty Development in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Yale University:

Héctor Arce (Astronomy)
Alicia Schmidt Camacho (American Studies; ER&M)
Enrique M. De La Cruz (Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry)
Jacqueline Goldsby (English; African American Studies; American Studies)
Inderpal Grewal (WGSS; ER&M; American Studies; Anthropology; South Asian Studies)
Briallen Hopper (English)
D.S. Fahmeed Hyder (Biomedical Engineering; Radiology & Biomedical Imaging)
Kathryn Lofton (Religious Studies; American Studies; History; WGSS; Divinity), *committee chair*
Reina Maruyama (Physics)
Alan Mikhail (History)
Mary O'Brien (Psychology)
Jonathan Parr (Chemistry)
David M. Post (Ecology and Evolutionary Biology)
Jennifer Richeson (Psychology)
Steven Wilkinson (Political Science)
Bethany Zemba (Office of the Dean of FAS), *ex officio*