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Background

I. The City University of New York’s Commitment to Diversity

Since its origins as an institution to serve “the children of the whole people,” controlled “not by the privileged few, but by the privileged many,” and established through a vote of the people of New York City, The City University of New York (CUNY) has had a commitment to diversity and inclusion. CUNY has historically offered a high-quality education to a diverse student body, and its academic priorities and programs reflect its commitment to serve an increasingly diverse population of New Yorkers.

The University’s commitment to diversity is posited on the following principles:

1. Engendering values and implementing policies that enhance respect for individuals and their cultures promotes excellence and an inclusive educational experience;

2. Diversifying the University’s workforce strengthens the institution, encourages the exchange of new ideas, and enriches campus life;

3. Cultivating diversity and combatting bigotry are an inextricable part of the educational mission of the University; and

4. Fostering tolerance, sensitivity, and mutual respect throughout CUNY is beneficial to all members of the University community.

As the nation’s leading urban public university, the University embraces a set of core values: an insistence on academic rigor, accountability, and assessment coupled with an unwavering commitment to serve students from all backgrounds and support a world-class faculty. These values enhance the University’s fundamental mission of teaching, research, and service.

Consistent with the mandate of the New York State Education Law “to provide access to higher education for all who seek it,” the University endeavors to “continue to maintain and expand its commitment to academic excellence and to the provision of equal access and opportunity for students, faculty, and staff from all ethnic and racial groups and from both sexes.”

In addition to implementing federal, state, and local regulations, the University has expanded its traditional adherence to the concept of non-discrimination by affirming its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. This commitment is evidenced in numerous resolutions of the Board of Trustees and CUNY’s Master Plans.

Diversity and inclusion promote the exchange of ideas and knowledge, scholarly discourse, and community engagement. Simply put, diversity helps the University provide a richer learning
experience for students, a better teaching and researching experience for faculty, and a more productive working experience for staff.¹

II. The University’s Diversity Accomplishments

A. Faculty Demographics

CUNY’s success in meeting its commitment to diversity is evidenced through faculty and student demographics. Its efforts to provide equal access, employment, and learning opportunities to members of all ethnic and racial groups and both sexes have been rewarding.

From 1990 to 2010, notable positive changes have occurred in the gender, ethnic, and racial composition of the faculty. These quantitative results are highlighted below:

| TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY BY YEARS: 1990, 2000, and 2010 (includes substitute and visiting faculty)² |
|---|---|---|
| | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| Male | 62.8 | 57.3 | 52.5 |
| Female | 37.2 | 42.7 | 47.5 |
| Total Minority | 21.0 | 26.2 | 32.3 |
| Black | 11.6 | 12.4 | 12.7 |
| Hispanic (incl. Puerto Rican) | 5.1 | 6.8 | 8.8 |
| Puerto Rican | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Hispanic (excl. Puerto Rican) | 2.7 | 4.2 | 6.2 |
| Asian/Pac. Isl. | 4.2 | 6.7 | 10.6 |
| Am. Ind./Al. Nat. | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| White | 73.6 | 67.5 | 61.8 |
| Italian American | 5.4 | 6.3 | 5.9 |

The representation of underrepresented minority groups has increased considerably over the past two decades. In fact, among the 100 largest U.S. university systems, CUNY ranks No. 8 in minority faculty representation and No. 15 in female faculty representation.³

¹ See Appendix I for more information on the benefits of diversity.
³ CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment analysis of IPEDS institutional data queried from the IPEDS Data Center.
B. Student Demographics

The percentage of almost every underrepresented group has increased significantly over the past 20 years. Among the 100 largest U.S. university systems, CUNY ranks No. 7 in minority student representation and No. 15 in representation of women.  

TOTAL UNDERGRADUATE and GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY YEARS: 1990, 2000, and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (incl. Puerto Rican)</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac. Isl.</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./Al. Nat.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment analysis of IPEDS institutional data queried from the IPEDS Data Center.
5 CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (www.oira.cuny.edu).
This increase coincides with a dramatic surge in enrollment, particularly undergraduate enrollment, during the same period.

| TOTAL NUMBER OF UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY YEARS: 1990, 2000, and 2010⁶ |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|               | 1990           | 2000           | 2010           |
| Undergraduate | 174,165        | 167,969        | 228,484        |
| Graduate      | 26,463         | 27,434         | 33,837         |
| TOTAL         | 200,628        | 195,403        | 262,321        |

C. Establishment of the Office of the University Dean for Recruitment and Diversity

The University established the Office of the University Dean for Recruitment and Diversity in 2007 to advocate for diversity and inclusion issues, provide active oversight and coordination of these areas, and to encourage and support diversity efforts across the University.

This office has led and supported major University initiatives, including Inclusive Excellence and the recent Faculty Diversity Study.

D. University-wide Diversity Initiatives

The University is particularly proud of its successful diversity initiatives, including the Faculty Fellowship Publications Program (FFPP), Diversity Projects Development Fund (DPDF), Black Male Initiative, Latino Faculty Recruitment Initiative, and Decade of Science initiative.

Faculty Fellowship Publications Program (FFPP)

The FFPP supports the efforts of new faculty to achieve tenure and promotion by offering nontenured faculty the opportunity to work with senior faculty from across the University who serve as writing facilitators and mentors. The program also enables participants to provide each other with constructive criticism, support, and encouragement during the writing process. Sponsored by the University Office of Recruitment and Diversity in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources Management, this initiative is part of the University's commitment to increasing diversity in the professoriate. Over the last 10 years, nearly 500 faculty members have participated in the program.

Diversity Projects Development Fund (DPDF)

⁶ CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (www.oira.cuny.edu)
The Diversity Projects Development Fund provides support for educational projects, scholarly research, and creative and professional activities that promote diversity, multiculturalism, and excellence. Since its inception in 2001, nearly 300 awards have been granted, with an average grant amount of $3,500.

**Black Male Initiative (BMI)**

In 2005, the University created a Black Male Initiative (BMI) based on program models at Medgar Evers College. This program funds projects throughout the University that are designed to increase the enrollment, retention, and graduation rates of students from groups that are severely underrepresented in higher education, including African, African American/Black, Caribbean, and Latino/Hispanic males. Although targeted to underrepresented males, projects do not discriminate and serve as models for improving educational outcomes for all students. With the support of grants from the New York City Council, CUNY BMI has funded campus projects that focus primarily on outreach and mentoring to improve recruitment and retention. In addition to campus efforts, there is an annual CUNY-wide BMI conference that features nationally recognized experts on improving educational outcomes.

**Latino Faculty Initiative**

In fall 2006, Chancellor Matthew Goldstein established the CUNY Latino Faculty Initiative to strengthen CUNY’s outreach and recruitment efforts within the Latino community in higher education. The project is focused on the following areas:

- Faculty recruitment
- Faculty retention
- Strengthening the CUNY pipeline
- Support for leadership development
- Recruitment of outstanding scholars
- Support for Puerto Rican, Latina/o, Caribbean, and Latin American Studies

This Initiative has made great strides in attracting high-performing Latino faculty to CUNY. In the process, it has identified a number of best practices in the areas of faculty recruitment, faculty retention, and pipeline strategies. The expertise gained from this initiative offers instructive models for improving recruitment in many extremely competitive disciplines.

**Decade of Science Initiative**

The City University of New York designated the years 2005 to 2015 the “Decade of Science,” renewing its commitment to creating a healthy pipeline to science, technology, engineering, and math fields by advancing science at the highest levels, recruiting talented faculty, training students to teach in these areas, and encouraging young people, particularly women and minorities, to study in these disciplines. The initiative has spotlighted CUNY women scientists through a “Breaking Boundaries in Science Research” outreach effort, which highlights their pioneering research in cutting-edge areas of applied and basic science.
III. Moving Forward: Diversity Study

Although the University can point to numerous diversity and inclusion indicators of success, its goal is to remain an innovative diversity leader among institutions of higher education. To support this goal, Chancellor Goldstein commissioned a Diversity Study Steering Committee (DSSC)\(^7\) to oversee the University’s faculty diversity study. The DSSC worked with Jennifer S. Rubain, dean for recruitment and diversity, and Cambridge Hill Partners, a consulting firm with many years of experience in the areas of diversity and strategic innovation in higher education.

To examine recruitment, retention, and accountability challenges and opportunities within the University, Cambridge Hill Partners undertook the following activities:

- Interviewed trustees, members of the chancellery, presidents, provosts, deans, faculty, affirmative action officers, HR directors, labor designees, and directors of institutes/centers/initiatives;
- Facilitated working group sessions with faculty and representatives from campus HR and diversity offices;
- Conducted focus groups based on identity: African-American/Black, Asian, White/Jewish\(^8\), Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender, Hispanic/Latino(a), individuals with disabilities, Italian American, men and women;
- Held discussions with deans and provosts;
- Reviewed and analyzed University employment data;
- Moderated strategy sessions in each of the five boroughs;
- Debriefed campus participants in the University’s Inclusive Excellence Initiative;
- Conducted external best practice interviews with representatives from higher education institutions;
- Reviewed articles and reports on diversity best practices; and
- Analyzed data from the CUNY Faculty Diversity Climate Survey.

At the end of the process, a Diversity Study Report\(^9\) was submitted to Chancellor Goldstein. The report concluded that the University had made significant accomplishments of which it should be proud. The report also recommended that in order for the University to remain a leader in faculty diversity and inclusion, it should re-focus its attention on vision, leadership, recruitment, climate and retention, and accountability, with a specific focus on resource allocation and innovative programs.

Chancellor Goldstein recognized that a University Diversity Action Plan was needed to build upon the study’s recommendations and charged an Ad Hoc Committee on Strengthening Faculty Diversity\(^10\) with that task. The committee’s plan sets forth strategies based upon nationally recognized best practices to help the University and its colleges and faculty work towards aligning diversity goals with

\(^7\) See Appendix II for the list of committee members.
\(^8\) The Jewish group was added because a number of faculty, who would be categorized as White for federal reporting purposes, noted that a Jewish category would better represent their identity group.
\(^9\) See Appendix III for the Diversity Study Report.
\(^10\) See Appendix IV for the list of committee members.
governance rules. For example, given the importance of the faculty search committee in determining who is ultimately selected for an open position, this plan recognizes that faculty search committees are central to the academic enterprise and are best able to support the plan’s goal of increasing faculty diversity.

The Diversity Action Plan below was developed with the broad objective to sustain and enhance the University’s standing as a national model for diversity.

IV. Diversity Action Plan: Goals and Strategies

The City University of New York has a proud heritage of pluralism, both in its student body and faculty ranks. The University’s progress is clear; the University-wide data is compelling. The Diversity Action Plan builds upon this foundation so that CUNY may continue as a national leader in faculty diversity and inclusion among institutions of higher education. Sustaining a community in which diversity influences all levels is a continuous process requiring a comprehensive approach focused on activities that will reap the largest return.

The plan focuses on five principles:

A. Establish a Vision
B. Encourage Proactive Leadership
C. Strengthen Recruitment
D. Improve Climate in Support of Retention
E. Delineate Accountability

A. Establish a Vision

CUNY must remain a leader among institutions of higher education in faculty diversity. This vision for diversity and inclusion will be widely communicated and embedded in CUNY’s Master Plan. All activities detailed in this plan are designed to support this vision and will be measured by the degree to which they impact the vision.

B. Encourage Proactive Leadership

Proactive leadership at every level of the University is critical to meeting the goals set forth below. This plan recognizes that leadership must come from presidents and senior administrators as well as the faculty since professorial hiring decisions are most often made at the department level. Also, the University recognizes that the environment within an academic department strongly influences whether or not a junior faculty member, particularly one from an underrepresented group, feels welcomed and included.

11 See appendix V for the CUNY Diversity Vision Statement.
GOAL: The University will provide strong leadership for diversity and inclusion.

Strategies to support this goal:

1. The chancellor has appointed an Advisory Committee on Strengthening Faculty Diversity (ACD) to monitor the implementation of the University’s Diversity Action Plan. This committee is composed of trustees, the chancellery, presidents, a faculty representative, and a student representative.

2. The University Affirmative Action Committee will be renamed and reconstituted. The new body will be the University Advisory Council on Diversity and will be charged with advising the vice chancellor for human resources management and the university dean for recruitment and diversity on ways to deepen the University’s commitment to creating and sustaining an inclusive community. The council will facilitate system-wide exchanges of information, strategies, and recommendations relating to climate, recruitment, retention, and success metrics. The council will be composed of faculty, staff, and administrators from around the University. A student representative will also be included.

3. The chancellery will engage presidents in moving toward a new model of faculty recruitment and retention focused on diversity and inclusion instead of just headcount. This includes discussions on climate and culture, practices and policies that support a sense of belonging for all faculty, and acknowledgement of presidents who increase retention efforts and diversify the faculty.

4. As part of the Performance Management Process, the chancellor will request that each president submit a Strategic Diversity Plan for her/his campus that identifies specific activities that will be undertaken to increase faculty diversity and foster inclusion.

5. Subject to campus Strategic Diversity Plans, the chancellery will assess the need to provide supplemental resources to help the colleges recruit and retain faculty who contribute to the diversity of the institution.

GOAL: The presidents, provosts, and deans will provide strong leadership for diversity and inclusion.

Strategies to support this goal:

1. The presidents will revitalize campus diversity committees in order to design and implement the Strategic Diversity Plans; to advise the president on all matters and issues of diversity; to facilitate and promote ongoing opportunities for public discussion related to diversity; to promote educational programs to reflect pluralistic values and goals; and to report annually to the University Office of Recruitment and Diversity on the work of the committee and the progress made toward fostering diversity throughout the college.
2. Provosts and/or deans will be charged with working collaboratively with the campus diversity officers to reinforce the need for diversity among the faculty. The success of this collaboration will be reviewed in campus performance evaluations.

C. Strengthen Recruitment

Excellence at the University is dependent on the recruitment of exceptional faculty members. The faculty search committee is the core component in hiring a talented and diverse faculty. These committees operate through the authority of the college and academic discipline to select the best candidate. However, presidents, provosts, and deans must engage these committees to ensure that they utilize the most effective search practices.

GOAL: The University, presidents, provosts, and deans will provide support to faculty search committees and recruitment efforts.

Strategies to support this goal:

1. The University will establish a Scholar-In-Residence Program to attract outstanding scholars whose research, teaching, or service will contribute to diversity at The City University of New York. Special effort will be made to collaborate with Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPIs), and the international higher education network of the Calandra Institute.

2. The University will establish a Postdoctoral Fellowship Program to offer postdoctoral research fellowships, faculty mentoring, and eligibility for hiring incentives to outstanding scholars in all fields whose research, teaching, or service will contribute to increasing diversity at The City University of New York.

3. The University Office of Recruitment and Diversity will develop a search “tool kit” to provide a comprehensive set of guidelines for faculty searches. A tool kit will also be developed to outline creative options to attract, recruit, and hire diverse faculty.

4. The University Office of Recruitment and Diversity will support the efforts of campus diversity officers by instituting trainings on topics such as effective practices for search committees.

5. Provosts and deans will work with departments to broaden job descriptions in order to attract the widest range of qualified candidates possible.

6. Presidents will ensure that campus diversity officers meet with search chairs early in the search process to develop a plan for “pool-building” activities, e.g., contacting colleagues in the field who train graduate students in that discipline.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{12}\) See Appendix VI for more information on energizing search committees.
7. Presidents will charge provosts and/or deans with encouraging departments to create diverse search committees, composed of individuals who have technical expertise in the discipline and a detailed understanding of the open position. Provosts should also clarify their role in meeting with the finalist(s) in accordance with the campus governance plan.

8. In consultation with the presidents, the chancellery will develop a plan to leverage existing institutes/centers/programs such as the Asian American/Asian Research Institute, Calandra Institute, and Dominican Studies Institute to further strengthen efforts to diversify the faculty.

D. Improve Climate in Support of Retention

It is critical that the University not only recruit diverse faculty members but also create an environment that supports their retention. By offering a supportive climate that is welcoming and values the contributions of all its members, the University will retain faculty members as they progress through their careers.

GOAL: In conjunction with the campuses, the University will endeavor to foster a welcoming and inclusive environment.

Strategies to support this goal:

1. The University will sponsor a competition to recognize departments that create innovative mentoring programs for junior faculty. These programs should include the essential components of an effective mentoring program, such as ongoing evaluation and assessment measures that foster continued development.

2. The Faculty Fellowship Publication Program’s focus on mentoring will be enhanced to support ongoing activities that promote networking and a sense of community.

3. Because work/life issues impact retention and may disproportionately affect the careers of academic women, the University will ensure that work/life benefits and services are widely communicated. For example, the University, through its relationship with Corporate Counseling Associates (CCA), offers free resources and support for those balancing work with child-care or elder-care responsibilities.

4. The University will develop an “Inclusive and Respectful Workplace” training program for the campus diversity officers. To develop participants’ diversity leadership skills, this train-the-trainer program will address cross-cultural communication; managing diverse departments; and understanding commonalities and differences of perspectives and experiences that may be affected by race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and other social identities. The campus diversity officers will be expected to use the information learned to conduct workshops on their campuses.

5. The University Office of Recruitment and Diversity will institute an electronic exit interview program to gather substantive information about why faculty members leave CUNY. This
information will be shared with the campuses and used to determine whether diversity initiatives could make a difference in reducing attrition.

E. Clearly Delineate Accountability

Accountability measures are critical to meeting the goals of the Diversity Action Plan and have been included throughout the plan. The following will further ensure accountability for success in meeting goals.

GOAL: To provide reports on progress toward Diversity Action Plan goals.

Strategies to support this goal:

1. The University Office of Institutional Research will work with the University Office of Recruitment and Diversity to develop metrics and design reports to show data on rates of tenure and promotion, time to tenure and promotion, and turnover.

2. Ongoing reports comparing CUNY’s progress against peer institutions will be released periodically.

INITIATIVES THAT SUPPORT ALL GOALS AND STRATEGIES

• The Office of Recruitment and Diversity will investigate and share external grant opportunities and funding that may enhance faculty diversity and provide support throughout the University.

• In consultation with the Office of the Chancellor, the University Office of Recruitment and Diversity will organize a biannual diversity conference beginning in spring 2013 that will provide a forum for faculty from across the academy to share research and learn best practices in the area of diversity and inclusion.
Appendix I: Benefits of Diversity
The Benefits of Diversity
Prepared by the Office of Recruitment and Diversity

The City University of New York (CUNY) has long been guided by the principles of diversity and inclusion. These principles are interwoven into its mission and are bolstered by empirical results of studies showing that diversity is essential to educational excellence. Diversity enables American society, and the academy in particular, to maintain intellectual leadership by harnessing the innovative capacity of the nation’s entire talent pool (Beyond Bias and Barriers, 2006 report of the National Academy of Sciences).

Educating and employing members of all segments of the nation’s rapidly changing population is imperative to developing an educated workforce with the values, culture, and perspectives to provide solutions to pressing local, state, national, and international problems (Grant-Thomas and Orfield 2009). In addition, diversity within the college-going population is indicative of the extent to which equal opportunity and social justice are embedded into society.

What are diversity and inclusion? Diversity denotes an understanding of difference that includes many dimensions, including race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, religion, age, national origin, socioeconomic status, and other characteristics of social identity. These interconnected differences serve as sources of knowledge, encourage new research, and contribute to the University’s capacity to address societal issues, create new curricular areas, and develop new paths for engagement with external communities (CUNY Master Plan 2004-2008). Inclusion is the creation of a climate where all feel valued and appreciated, where there is meaningful interaction among groups, and where diverse groups participate in academic and administrative decision making, and barriers to inclusion—whether policies, practices, or systems—are identified and addressed. An inclusive environment embraces diversity’s multi-faceted dimensions and allows students, faculty, and staff to thrive (Brooklyn College Diversity and Inclusion Plan 2008-2012).

The value of diversity to education has been informed by research, demonstrated by practice and inspired by commitment. One of the earliest national longitudinal studies looked at undergraduates from more than 200 four-year colleges and universities. The study revealed that institutional policies fostering diversity had positive effects on students’ cognitive development, satisfaction with the college experience, and leadership abilities. These institutions had policies that encouraged faculty to include themes relating to diversity in their research and teaching, and provided students with opportunities to confront racial and multicultural issues in the classroom and in extracurricular settings (Astin 1993).

Diversity creates opportunities to engage in difficult dialogues about challenging issues—a central tenet of the academic experience. Findings document that students who interacted with racially and ethnically diverse peers both informally and within the classroom showed the greatest “engagement in active thinking, growth in intellectual engagement and motivation, and growth in intellectual and academic skills” (Gurin et al 2002). A subsequent study of students at selective colleges concluded that meaningful engagement rather than casual and superficial interactions led to greater benefits (Espenshade and Radford 2009).
In *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003), the Supreme Court, using basic sociological data and tenets, affirmed that the educational benefits of diversity are considerable and concrete, rather than merely theoretical, and reiterated that diversity is a compelling goal for colleges and universities because it enlivens classroom discussions, minimizes stereotypes, and prepares students for success in the global marketplace (Chang et al 2003). Although recent court decisions have focused on student admissions, some legal scholars see the judicial argument regarding the significance of diversity to the educational endeavor as implicitly supportive of the diversification of faculty (The Civil Rights Project, Harvard 2003). Researchers point out that the Court not only accepted the argument of the important role diversity plays in the global economy but also recognized that a diverse college environment contributes to the preparation of students to serve as leaders (Springer 2003).

**Faculty Diversity Fosters Excellence in Teaching and Research**

Research also shows that diverse working groups tend to be more productive, creative, and innovative than homogeneous groups, and this suggests that developing a diverse faculty enhances teaching and research (Herring 2009). Diverse representation in discipline[s], intellectual outlook, cognitive styles, and personalities offer students the variety of ideas that constitute a dynamic intellectual community, including:

- Integrating knowledge and inquiry across disciplines;
- Using intellectual work in the service of addressing problems of society;
- Developing student-centered teaching methods and pedagogical practices that stimulate active learning and critical thinking in students; and
- Providing stronger support for educational goals that strengthen the affective, moral, and civic development of students (Hurtado 2000).

As diverse faculty members broaden themes pursued in scholarship, they generate curricular changes and introduce different forms of pedagogy in the classroom. These transformations contribute to the richness of the environment for teaching and research. Data from UCLA’s Higher Education Research Institute indicate that scholars from minority groups increased and enriched scholarship and teaching in many academic disciplines by offering new perspectives and by raising new questions, challenges, and concerns (Turner 2000 and Antonio 2002). Underrepresented men and women improve the undergraduate teaching of science and mathematics, which in turn contributes to gains in the scientific and quantitative literacy of undergraduates who begin college with broad differences in ability and prior preparation. The development of instructional methods that foster respect for cultural differences and addresses variant learning styles results in greater access to STEM fields for all students (Hurtado 2000).

Diversity within the faculty also has produced new knowledge about national and global cultural traditions that continues to transform curricula. These changes, whether the requirement of a single course addressing diversity or infusing material into existing offerings, help prepare students for a changing world (Humpreys 2009). A reading of recent scholarship details the persuasive evidence to support the need to prepare all students for a diverse society, describes the role diverse faculty play in
the academic success of all students, and outlines contributions made by diverse faculty to new scholarship and innovative approaches to teaching (Turner, Gonzalez and Wood 2008).

Faculty diversity builds upon itself. As the diversity of the faculty increases, more individuals from diverse backgrounds are attracted to the campus, minimizing the “tokenism” and isolation underrepresented faculty sometimes experience and increasing their retention. Several studies address the importance of a welcoming departmental and institutional environment (Aguirre 2000). These findings underscore that diversity within the faculty helps to increase the pipeline of academic talent.

Students who have diverse faculty as role models can engage and understand perspectives both similar to and different from their own. Diverse faculty also help underrepresented students to envision themselves as members of the academy in all fields. A survey of more than 1,000 faculty members in departments granting doctoral degrees in computer science, chemistry, electrical engineering, microbiology, and physics found that women faculty played important roles in fostering the education and success of women graduate students (Astin 2003).

In addition to fostering faculty development in the areas of scholarship and pedagogy, learning to respect and appreciate others’ cultural and stylistic differences is equally integral to institutional improvement. The results from controlled research studies demonstrate that people often hold unconscious, implicit assumptions that influence their judgments and interactions with others. Objective scholars strive to judge people on merit, the quality of their work, and the nature of their achievements; however, copious research demonstrates that a lifetime of experience and cultural history shapes everyone. Studies have found that even people who have strong egalitarian values and believe that they are not biased may unconsciously behave in discriminatory ways (Dovidio 2001).

Becoming aware of unconscious assumptions and behaviors that influence interactions enables all faculty to minimize these beliefs and behaviors and derive maximum benefits from diversity. Research has even shown a tendency for members of search and appointment committees to be influenced by unintentional bias. Among the examples cited are expectations or assumptions about physical or social characteristics associated with race, gender, age, and ethnicity, as well as those associated with certain job descriptions, academic institutions, and fields of study (Dovidio 2001).

The research supporting the benefits of diversity and inclusion offers a compelling reason for continuing efforts to increase faculty diversity and foster an environment that best allows all members of the University community to thrive. Sustaining and enhancing a culture of diversity and inclusion enables CUNY to capitalize on a multitude of skills, perspectives, and experiences in order to better advance its mission of research, teaching, and service. A diverse and inclusive environment results in a University community composed of members who are more thoughtful scholars; more effective collaborators; more creative teachers; and more understanding colleagues. It also ensures that CUNY’s students are prepared for a global and interconnected marketplace.
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Appendix III: Diversity Study by Cambridge Hill Partners
The City University of New York
Faculty Diversity Study
February-June 2011
CUNY Faculty Diversity Study
Report

Overview

Background

Since early February 2011, Cambridge Hill Partners, Inc. has been working with the Diversity Study Steering Committee (DSSC)*, appointed by Chancellor Matthew Goldstein, and Jennifer Rubain, Esq., University Dean for Recruitment and Diversity, to conduct a study of the current state of diversity and inclusion throughout the University as it relates to faculty. The overall goal is to determine how the University can further support faculty diversity and inclusion efforts at the campus level and throughout the system. An effective determination of priorities for diversity and inclusion is dependent on clarity about current issues and options that are widely supported by administrative and academic leaders. This study explores current policies, practices, initiatives and programs as well as the hopes and concerns of faculty.

In order to facilitate your understanding of terms utilized throughout the report, please review Appendix B-Table of Terms.

Key Objectives

The following objectives guided the activities for this project.

- Conduct a self-assessment of current recruitment and retention policies, initiatives, and activities at the City University of New York (CUNY);
- Identify issues inherent to CUNY and academia that impact the recruitment, selection, development, and retention of faculty from underrepresented groups (URG);
- Develop recommendations for improving representation, retention and satisfaction of URG faculty as well as strengthening the climate for diversity and inclusion for all faculty.

Activities**

The following are the activities undertaken by Cambridge Hill Partners to examine recruitment, retention, and accountability challenges and opportunities:

- Interviewed Trustees, Chancellery, Presidents, Provosts, Deans, Faculty, Affirmative Action Officers, HR Directors, Labor Designees, and Directors of Institutes/Centers/Initiatives;
- Facilitated Working Group sessions with faculty and representatives from campus HR and Diversity Offices;

*See Appendix A for list of DSSC members.
**See Appendices C-G for more information about the activities.
• Conducted focus groups based on identity- African-American/Black, Asian, Caucasian/White/Jewish\(^1\), GLBTQ, Hispanic/Latino(a), Individuals with Disabilities, Italian American, Men and Women;

• Held discussions with Deans and Provosts;

• Reviewed and analyzed University employment data;

• Moderated Strategy Sessions in each of the five boroughs;

• Debriefed campus participants in the University’s Inclusive Excellence Initiative;

• Conducted external best practice interviews with representatives from higher education institutions;

• Reviewed articles and reports on diversity best practices; and

• Analyzed data from the CUNY Faculty Diversity Climate Survey.

**KEY STRATEGIC ISSUES**

Based on the activities outlined above, the following are key strategic issues that have emerged from this study.

**Definition and Vision**

• There is no shared definition and vision of diversity and inclusion within the University. Throughout the qualitative portion of this study, participants consistently raised the question “what’s the University’s diversity goal?” Specifically, in terms of faculty diversity, where does CUNY see itself in 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years? To what extent should CUNY’s faculty demographics reflect the student body, the City’s population, or National availability data used for affirmative action reporting?

**Recruitment**

• The University’s commitment to diversifying its faculty is reflected in its numbers, especially when compared to national and peer data. However, there is still underutilization reported in the campus affirmative action plans. Using the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), data was compared for the following categories - Female, Total Minority, Asian, Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino(a). CUNY’s percentages of URM and Women full-time faculty were generally higher than at peer institutions\(^2\). Despite this positive position, there are a number of concerns:

  o The Fall 2010 CUNY Underutilization Summary Report, included below, shows that at some colleges there is significant underutilization, particularly among URM faculty.

---

\(^1\) The Jewish group was added because a number of faculty, who would be categorized as White for federal reporting purposes, expressed that a Jewish category would better represent their identity group.

\(^2\) “Peer” institutions include the California State System, Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey, SUNY System, University of Florida System, University of Maryland System, and the University of Wisconsin System.
Since 2001, the percentage of representation of CUNY’s Black/African American, Puerto Rican and Italian American full-time faculty has remained almost unchanged; the representation of Hispanic/Latino(a) (excluding Puerto Rican) full-time faculty has grown less than 2%; and growth in the representation of Asian and Women full-time faculty was 3.5% and 3.9% respectively.

Participants in the forums cited constraints in available resources as well as some search committees lacking the needed knowledge and skill to make their departments more competitive in recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. Additionally, they noted that CUNY should more effectively leverage existing internal infrastructures such as Institutes (university-wide), Centers (at campuses), and Initiatives for outreach and recruitment.

Climate/Retention

- While the results of the CUNY Faculty Diversity Climate Survey and 2010 COACHE Survey
(Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education)3 show few differences in responses based on gender, race and ethnicity, key issues that emerged from the qualitative research in this study include the need to:

- Create a University culture that encourages URGs to consider, choose and stay at CUNY; and
- Foster a more inclusive culture that benefits all faculty.

Related to these two issues, participants in faculty focus groups indicated the following:

- **Women** report that compared to their male colleagues they often carry higher service loads; receive less mentoring, and feel stress related to balancing work and family commitments.
- **Men** report the need for the University to better articulate the value of faculty diversity to CUNY and to provide the resources required to achieve stated goals.
- **Asians** report a concern about raising issues for fear of retaliation and an absence of a trustworthy process for resolution on some campuses; narrow criteria for some searches results in little diversity within the applicant pools; and inconsistent use of criteria related to promotion.
- **Hispanics/Latinos(as)** report being seen as members of “one culture” with little recognition or appreciation for the range of differences in backgrounds, i.e. subcultures; lack of consistent and quality mentoring; experiencing bias; feeling overburdened by service commitments; and believing they have to prove themselves much more than White colleagues.
- **Italian Americans** report that their issues are not taken seriously; the recruitment process often overlooks Italian Americans; and they can be labeled as troublemakers if they raise the issue of their protected status within the University.
- **Blacks** report that there are few formal processes to support their professional development; success is dependent on one’s ability to establish informal networks; perception that more time spent mentoring students than White counterparts; and must work twice as hard to get half as far as other faculty.
- **Caucasians/Whites/Jewish** report that this group is not as monolithic as some may believe and this lack of understanding is reflected in subtle stereotyping; decentralized structure of CUNY makes it difficult to implement University-wide diversity initiatives; and effective practices may exist at the local level, but are not be shared across the University.
- **Gays, Lesbians, Bisexuals, Transgendered and Questioning (GLBTQ)** report some colleges and departments tolerate unwelcoming and anti-gay behavior; feel left out of diversity initiatives; believe that campus employees could benefit from sensitivity training on GLBTQ issues; and believe scholarship on GLBTQ issues is not valued.

3 The CUNY Faculty Diversity Climate Survey was sent to all full-time faculty in May of 2011. The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) is a consortium of over 160 colleges, universities and systems across North America committed to making the academic workplace more attractive and equitable for faculty. COACHE surveys are only conducted at senior colleges.
Individuals with Disabilities report CUNY as unwelcoming; if one has a physical disability the campuses can be difficult to navigate; if a cognitive or emotional disability there is a fear that if known that may impact one’s career; and they believe there is little consideration given to recruiting individuals with disabilities.

The abovementioned issues were reiterated by members of the Working Group and participants in the Strategy Sessions.

Incentives

- There is uncertainty and apprehension about the use of incentives for recognizing and rewarding departments’ efforts to increase diversity among the faculty. Uncertainty about what incentives and resources are available to encourage and support departments in hiring and retaining a diverse faculty, e.g. target of opportunity funds, start-up funds. Apprehension that targeting financial resources can create the perception of “reverse discrimination” or label someone an “affirmative action hire.”

Accountability

- A key strategic issue is ensuring accountability for advancing diversity and inclusion efforts throughout the system. While many highlighted the need to hold presidents and provosts accountable, it was consistently noted that faculty and administrators across CUNY must be engaged in advancing diversity and inclusion efforts. While most believe that the Chancellor, Presidents and Provosts are ultimately accountable, it was noted that they cannot make progress without faculty support. Thus, there is strong support for shared leadership that calls for department chairs and faculty to play a visible role in advancing diversity and inclusion efforts.

Indicators of Success

- Related to accountability, there is a need to expand on current mechanisms (i.e. Affirmative Action Plans, PMP) to include other measures by which to evaluate progress, i.e. work climate, retention, faculty development and support, work/life issues.

KEY THEMES AND FINDINGS

It is clear that CUNY is an exceptional institution of higher education. The diversity of CUNY’s student body is consistently noted as one of its greatest strengths. With a mission of access and excellence, CUNY serves as a portal to opportunity and promise by offering quality education at affordable prices. And, faculty and administrators who participated in this study share a strong commitment to this mission.

With a goal of identifying issues inherent to CUNY that impact the recruitment, selection, development, and retention of URG faculty, the following are themes and findings that surfaced based on the analysis of University data, surveys, focus groups, working group sessions, strategy forums and interviews.
Additionally, throughout this report, the consultants have referenced research and practices reported by other organizations or institutions. The purpose of these external data points is to bring additional perspectives to CUNY’s challenges and opportunities as they relate to recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty and fostering inclusion.

**REPRESENTATION**

**Definition of Diversity**

- There does not appear to be a widely shared or applied definition of diversity at CUNY. While there is a diversity webpage on CUNY’s site, from campus to campus and, sometimes from department to department, faculty offered widely different perspectives related to defining diversity. For example, in the context of faculty, does diversity mean that the faculty should reflect the demographics of the student body, the population of NYC, the borough where the school is located, or national availability data? Additionally, given demographic changes in NYC how does CUNY’s definition of diversity adapt to these changes? Without clarity, successful change on the diversity front is more difficult to determine.

**Overall Findings from Data Review**

- **Comparative Data – IPEDS.** The percentage of University-wide full-time faculty in Fall 2009 was compared to national and to “peer” institution data from The U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Data was compared on the following categories: Total Minority, Asian, Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino(a), and Female. IPEDS does not report on Italian Americans and does not break out Puerto Ricans as a separate group. For the abovementioned categories, CUNY’s percentages in 2009 were higher than the national data (IPEDS Charts 1-5, pages 9-13).

When compared to peer institutions for 2009 (IPEDS Charts 6-10, pages 14-18):

- For Total Minority, CUNY at 31.6% is slightly higher than California at 29.7% and is between 9.7% and 18.6% higher than the remainder of its peers (IPEDs Chart 6).
- For Asian, CUNY at 10.5% is lower than California, Rutgers, Maryland, and Florida. Despite growth in Asian full-time faculty at CUNY, the University is not keeping pace with most of its peers (IPEDs Chart 7).
- For Black/African American, CUNY at 12.6% is almost 6% higher than any of its peers (IPEDs Chart 8).
- For Hispanic/Latino(a) CUNY, at 8.3% is slightly lower than California at 9.2%, but is between 3.5% and 5.9% higher than the remainder of its peers (IPEDs Chart 9).
- For Female, CUNY at 46.7% is comparable to California at 46.1% and is between 3.7% and 11.5% higher than the remainder of its peers (IPEDs Chart 10).
• **University Data.** The CUNY Charts 1 – 8 (pages 19-26) provide a snapshot of full-time faculty representation University-wide from 2001 to 2009*. The number of full-time faculty at the Senior Colleges increased by 1,071 (25.3%) and at the Community Colleges increased by 475 (33.9%).

• However, the increase in the total number of CUNY full-time faculty has not resulted in a substantial change in representation by race or gender. Over this period:
  - Total minority faculty as a % of the total faculty increased 5.2%
  - Asian faculty as a % of total faculty increased 3.5%
  - Black/African American faculty as % of total faculty increased 0.1%
  - Hispanic/Latino(a) (including Puerto Rican) faculty as a % of the total faculty increased 1.6%.
  - Italian American Faculty as a % of total faculty increased .08%
  - Puerto Rican Faculty as a % of total faculty increased .01%
  - Female faculty as a % of total faculty increased 3.9%.

*The snapshot of full-time faculty representation at the senior and community colleges from 2001-2009 (CUNY Charts 9-24) may be found in Appendices H and I.

**Snapshot of CUNY Faculty by Rank**

• From 2001-2009, CUNY experienced numerical growth in the Assistant, Associate and Distinguished Professor ranks. The Professor rank contracted. With the exception of Asians and Women, the proportional representation of URGs has not changed significantly. Specific data outlined below:
  - Asian faculty representation has increased in all ranks, except the Distinguished Professor ranks.
  - Black/African American representation has remained the same in the Assistant Professor rank, decreased in the Associate and Distinguished Professor ranks, and increased slightly in the Professor rank.
  - Hispanic/Latino(a) faculty representation has increased in all ranks.
  - Italian American faculty representation has increased except in the Assistant and Distinguished Professor ranks.
  - Women faculty increased at all levels.

• As of fall 2009, University-wide, URM faculty accounted for 38% of Assistant Professors, 30% of Associate Professors, 22% of Professors, and 9% of Distinguished Professors. Italian Americans represented 5% of Assistant Professors, 8% of Associate Professors, 7% of Professors, and 5% of Distinguished Professors. Women constituted 53% of Assistant Professors, 47% of Associate Professors, 37% of Professors, and 25% of Distinguished Professors.
• Faculty ranks are less diverse as faculty advance through the ranks of the professoriate.
  o As faculty advance through the ranks of the professoriate, the representation of URM s decline.
  o At the Associate Professor rank, Black/African American faculty decreased from 12.4% in 2001 to 9.7% in 2009. This decline raises questions of whether this group is getting tenure at the same rate as other faculty, leaving before tenure decisions are made, or leaving once attaining tenure for more attractive positions elsewhere?

• Potential Pipeline. An examination of the pipeline of doctoral recipients provides an overview of the pool of potential candidates for faculty positions. According to the National Science Foundation’s data on doctoral degree recipients from 2003 to 2008*, URM s increased for Science and Engineering (S&E) doctorate recipients as follows: Asian (24.6%), Black (24.5%), and Hispanic (45.2%). Over the same period, the number of non-S&E doctorates awarded to Asians increased by 23.3%, the number awarded to Blacks increased 6.3%, and the number awarded to Hispanics did not increase. For Women, the increase was 36.1 for S&E and 6.2% for non-S&E.

The NSF data documents substantial growth in the pipeline for doctorate recipients in S&E and some growth for Asians, Blacks, and Women in non-S&E fields. Given the NSF data, there is an opportunity for CUNY to increase the representation of URM s and Women.

CUNY Compared to National Representation
From IPEDS - Fall 2009

IPEDS - Chart 1

The City University of New York
UNIVERSITY-WIDE Full-Time Faculty (including Substitute and Visiting Titles)

TOTAL MINORITY
(Blacks, Hispanics including Puerto Ricans, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and Amer. Ind. / All Natives)
Source: Affirmative Action Summary Data - 2001 through 2009 and National Center for Education Statistics (IPEDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>2,274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Affirmative Action Summary Data and US. Dept. of Education.
IPEDS Chart 2

Source: Affirmative Action Summary Data and US. Dept of Education.
IPEDS Chart 3

Source: Affirmative Action Summary Data and U.S. Dept of Education.
IPEDS Chart 4

The City University of New York
UNIVERSITY-WIDE Full-Time Faculty (including Substitute and Visiting Titles)

HISPANIC (incl. Puerto Rican) / LATINO (A)
Source: Affirmative Action Summary Data - 2001 through 2009 and National Center for Education Statistics (IPEDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Fall 2009
National (IPEDS)

Source: Affirmative Action Summary Data and US. Dept of Education.
IPEDS Chart 5

UNIVERSITY-WIDE Full-Time Faculty (Including Substitute and Visiting Titles)

FEMALES
Source: Affirmative Action Summary Data - 2001 through 2009 and National Center for Education Statistics (IPEDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>2,831</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>3,131</td>
<td>3,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43.0
Fall 2009
National (IPEDS)

Source: Affirmative Action Summary Data and US. Dept of Education.
IPEDS Chart 6
IPEDS Chart 7
IPEDS Chart 8
IPEDS Chart 9
IPEDS Chart 10

IPEDS Fall 2009 TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY - FEMALE - CUNY vs Selected Systems - Percentage Comparison

- National (all Institutions) 42.0
- California State System 46.1
- Regent 38.3
- SUNY System 38.6
- University of Florida System 35.2
- University of Maryland System 38.4
- University of Wisconsin System 40.2
- CUNY - System 47.7
CUNY Representation Numbers

University-wide Faculty Representation by Race, Ethnicity and Gender 2001 – 2009

CUNY Chart 1

Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Universitywide, Race/Ethnicity: Asian
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: University-wide, Race/Ethnicity: Black/African-American
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CUNY Chart 3

Full-time Faculty 2001-2009

College: Universitywide, Race/Ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino(a) (including Puerto Rican)
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Universitywide, Race/Ethnicity: Puerto Rican
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009

College: Universitywide, Race/Ethnicity: Italian American
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009

College: Universitywide, Race/Ethnicity: White/Caucasian

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Universitywide, Gender: Men
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Universitywide, Gender: Women

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year
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RECRUITMENT

Sourcing

- It was consistently reported that many departments have not developed networks and pipelines beyond traditional advertising to identify potential URG candidates for faculty positions. Many departments rely on advertising positions through the CUNY website and mainstream academic periodicals such as The Chronicle of Higher Education. As a result, departments struggle to develop diverse applicant pools.

- In the “Lessons from Leaders in Faculty Diversity” section of the 2008 Breakthrough Advances in Diversity Report, there are two points that support this theme.
  
  #41 The traditional model of faculty recruiting — with all work falling to a committee created only a few months before the interview period — presents barriers to achieving superior outcomes in recruiting diverse faculty.
  
  #42 The length of the search cycle and the unavoidable demands of teaching and research prevent even highly dedicated search committees from achieving optimal results if others at the institution have not “primed the pump” by identifying and fostering relationships with both potential candidates and referral sources

- CUNY colleges and departments report having limited funds to support the development of alternate recruiting networks. For example, many described the need to support faculty’s attendance at national conferences that would provide opportunities for networking and identification of potential candidates.

- It was also noted that department chairs, faculty and search committees must have the knowledge and skill to reach out to and develop relationships with associations and institutions with large populations of URG members. This outreach needs to be proactive and continuous.

- Some academic officers expressed confusion about whether or not there are funds available from central administration for target of opportunity hiring.

- A number of CUNY departments and colleges have effectively expanded their networks to develop a more diverse pipeline, with particular success in the recruitment of women scholars. In these cases, it appears that their success has been a result of strong leadership from the chancellery, president, provost and dean levels and their ability to access funding to support alternate sourcing strategies. A notable and visible success in recruiting and retaining female scientists is Hunter College with its Gender Equity Project. Supported by the National Science Foundation, the project offers a range of resources for junior faculty. This type of initiative effectively positions CUNY to play a role in addressing the underrepresentation of women in the physical sciences, engineering and life sciences. (Breakthroughs Advances in Faculty Diversity).

The University’s Decade of Science Initiative which includes strong support for women in science is a significant example of an effective University program that aids the campuses

Search Committees
Some CUNY colleges report success in further diversifying the faculty by conducting targeted searches within academic areas that align with their college’s strategic plans. With constrained resources, targeting specific disciplines as areas of investment and then aligning faculty searches with those areas seems to be a strategy that has worked effectively at CUNY and should be continued.

It was consistently reported that many search committees do not have the knowledge and skill to perform effective searches that result in a diverse slate of candidates. There are a number of factors cited that can impact the effectiveness of a search committee:

- *Department Chair* – the department chair is described as having significant influence over the job description and search process.
- *Committee Membership* – often faculty and academic administrators described a lack of diversity on search committees. In some colleges, departments “borrow” underrepresented faculty from related fields for search committees. In other colleges, departments are reluctant to involve faculty from other disciplines in their searches. However, there is interest among study participants in increasing cross-departmental and college collaborations in an effort to create diverse search committees.
- *Funding* – inadequate financial support, or awareness of how to obtain such support, for bringing out-of-state candidates to campus.
- *Job Description* – overly specific job descriptions that limit the pool of available candidates and may in some cases serve to preclude the application of URM candidates.
- *Training* – inconsistent charging for committees on search processes including sourcing, screening, interviewing, hosting on campus visits, follow-up and final selection. While the current charges cover basic compliance issues, there needs to be more focus on ways in which to develop faculty ownership for outreach and development of recruiting networks.
- *Time* – how quickly the position needs to be filled can affect the quality of the search.
- *Downstream Support* - it is reported that downstream support for search committees is essential for success. The life cycle of a search process can conflict with the competing demands and pressures on faculty that are participating in search processes. The degree to which affirmative action and diversity officers proactively provide early stage support to search committees varies enormously across CUNY campuses. As noted in the *Breakthrough Report*, administrative staff can perform the upfront work of helping to identify the most effective networks, professional associations, and conferences for developing diverse candidate pools.
- *Compliance Orientation* – it is reported that sometimes URM candidates are invited to interview to “fulfill” affirmative action efforts and are not always considered serious candidates.

In the article, *The Demand for Diversity*, by Anne Gallagher and Cathy A. Trower published in the February 4, 2009 edition of the Chronicle of Higher Education, the authors describe the importance of educating search committees:
Educate search committees. Discuss tactics with search-committee members for developing a broad and deep pool of applicants and combating unconscious bias. Duke University’s vice provost for faculty diversity and development meets with search committees to discuss ways to find candidates of color who may have been overlooked, and how the committee can market the institution’s strengths, such as flexible work arrangements and cross-disciplinary research opportunities, to attract diverse talents. At the same time, committees should be honest about the institution’s drawbacks — whether that means location, demographic makeup of the campus, or cultural issues — during the search process. Recruiters should explain what actions the institution has taken to deal with those areas of concern.

Department Chairs

As reported, department chairs have significant influence in searches given that some of them have the authority to appoint search committees as well as develop faculty job descriptions. The following charts provide demographic information about department chairs in 2011*.

*Additional charts by campus in Appendix J
Affirmative Action/Compliance versus Diversity

- Particularly among faculty, it was noted that CUNY operates primarily from an affirmative action and compliance model. There is a desire to continue to more robustly support affirmative action by increasing the focus on diversity and inclusion. Specifically, faculty described a need to have more dialogue about how a diverse faculty can advance the mission of CUNY, enhance research and teaching, and support an extraordinarily diverse student body. Furthermore, there is a need for Deans and/or Provosts to engage faculty in discussion of what constitutes “best” when searching for “best and brightest” faculty candidates.

Competitive Packages and Resources

- Many faculty members believe their institution is unable to effectively compete for URG candidates because of their inability to offer competitive packages. Provosts vary in using resources flexibly and creatively such as additional compensation, start-up funds, and grant support.

- Some presidents and provosts have been proactive and successful in attracting outside resources in support of URM faculty recruitment and development. For instance, The City College and Hunter College both house the Research Centers in Minority Institutions (RCMI) program which is designed to enhance the research capacity and infrastructure at minority serving colleges and universities that offer doctorates in health sciences. RCMI support is provided by the National Center for Research Resources and the National Institutes of Health and this program provides funding to recruit established and promising researchers, acquire advanced instrumentation, modify laboratories for competitive research, fund core research facilities, and other research support. This program has resulted in increased faculty diversity that then helps attract other minority scholars and researchers.
CUNY should explore the range of governmental and private funding opportunities available to help meet its goals of increasing faculty diversity and creating an inclusive environment.

- In 2005, CUNY began the Decade of Science Initiative hiring cutting-edge researchers, increasing funding to doctoral students and upgrading science facilities, including a CUNY Advanced Science Research Center at The City College. Through this Initiative, particularly women and minorities are encouraged to study in the STEM disciplines (science, technology, engineering and mathematics). Since 2005, CUNY has seen student enrollment in these disciplines increase by more than 27 percent for women and more than 31 percent for underrepresented minorities.4

- In addition to compensation and support for research, other factors affecting the competitiveness of offers include access to affordable and convenient childcare, affordable housing, and spousal hiring. These areas are a significant competitive disadvantage for CUNY.

Need for Dialogue

- The demands of the marketplace are great and the supply of Ph.D. level minority faculty, although increasing, is still relatively small. A number of CUNY leaders noted that there should be more engagement of presidents and provosts in dialogue about the strategies required to be competitive.

- Some of CUNY’s academic officers expressed concern about offering competitive packages to URM faculty in order to be viable in the academic marketplace. The concerns are rooted in being a publicly funded institution as well as perceived inequities created by hiring new faculty at higher levels of compensation than earned by current faculty. Additionally, there are perceived differences among colleges’ ability to offer competitive packages based on type of school, resources, geographic location and legacy.

Contribution to National Pipeline Development and Grow Your Own

- Many segments of the University community expressed interest in CUNY contributing to pipeline development and a “grow your own” strategy. CUNY is uniquely positioned to make a significant contribution to increase the pipeline of URG Ph.Ds on a national level and to directly benefit from that growth.

Opportunities exist through the Graduate Center and programs such the National Science Foundation/AGEP (Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate). AGEP’s goal is to contribute to the national pipeline of URM minority scientists. There may be an opportunity to leverage this existing program to fill vacancies within CUNY such as Cal State has done with the Chancellor’s Doctoral Incentive Program (CDIP). This program repays up to $30,000 in graduate-school loans for Ph.D. recipients if they teach at a Cal State campus after earning their degree. Through this program, Cal State at Los Angeles has hired 32 faculty members over nearly 20 years. It should be noted that many institutions solicit private donations to support these types of diversity initiatives.

---

Target of Opportunity

- In addition to resources needed to support outreach and network development efforts, it was noted that colleges would like support for “target of opportunity hires,” i.e. hire someone without a planned search or as a result of a planned search that produces more than one candidate meeting a desired need – in this case, a qualified URG member.

- Many universities have established this funding opportunity, including peer institutions like SUNY which through its Faculty Diversity Program offers campuses the opportunity to compete for salary support and start-up packages to recruit outstanding scholars from different backgrounds, including individuals from groups that have been historically underrepresented in higher education.

Collaborative Marketing

- It was frequently noted that CUNY has made significant progress in branding efforts and should continue to pursue efforts that facilitate colleges and schools working together as one university. A number of individuals highlighted that there is an opportunity for CUNY to conduct proactive outreach and recruiting efforts by discipline at the University level versus at the college level. From a candidate’s perspective, the opportunity may seem more compelling when being recruited to CUNY versus a single college. While it is acknowledged that dual appointments through the Graduate Center have helped, there is more opportunity for collaboration across discipline and colleges. Ohio State University has developed interdisciplinary majors and minors that attract URM faculty to their campuses. The University is committed to providing funding for programming and centers and allowing for joint and dual appointments that are attractive to URM candidates.

- Another option for CUNY is to use the distinguished professor title to attract nationally renowned URG faculty members, whose very presence will help to attract other URG faculty.

Recruitment – Practices and Programs

- National research on proven best practices demonstrates that success in diversifying the faculty is driven by consistent implementation of effective practices in the search process. As noted in the 2008 Breakthrough Advances in Faculty Diversity, “superior recruiting drives success.” This success is a result of strong leadership among administrators and faculty as well as consistent replication of practices and strategies that have been proven to be successful.

- It was also noted in the Breakthrough Advances in Faculty Diversity, that “diversity leaders use three approaches to sustain recruiting and networking activity outside of formal searches, leaving search committees well positioned both to increase the number of highly qualified applicants from underrepresented groups and to persuade such finalists to accept an offer if one is extended.” The three approaches include:
  
  - Ongoing Faculty Ownership: In each department, designated faculty members are responsible for leading recruiting efforts that take place outside of formal searches.
Non-faculty Support: Administrative staff (with knowledge of appropriate discipline) help departments with the early-stage work of identifying and gathering information on highly qualified potential candidates from underrepresented groups, freeing up faculty time for recruiting activities only faculty can perform.

Resources for Upstream Recruiting: Central administration (or the dean’s office) provides financial support for networking and recruiting activities that take place outside of formal searches.

- At Columbia University’s School of Engineering and Applied Science, there is administrative support for reviewing sources such as conference proceedings, academic journals, departmental websites, and lists of grant recipients to identify diverse graduate students, postdocs, and junior faculty who are excelling in engineering. When a highly promising potential candidate is identified, appropriate faculty members, i.e. Department Chairs, are notified whether or not a search is active.

- UC Berkeley 2009 Strategic Plan for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity - Pathway to Excellence 2009 – outlines the following strategies related to recruitment.
  
  - Develop and refine faculty hiring, advancement, and reward structures to incorporate policies and best practices in equity, inclusion, and diversity.
  
  - Provide regularly occurring learning opportunities for departmental chairs, deans, and faculty equity advisors, as well as search committee members, for incorporating best practices on equity, inclusion, and diversity in the hiring and advancement of faculty.
  
  - Ensure all units and departments have and use reliable and meaningful data about prospective applicants that fully reflect the national talent pool for new positions.

- The Rochester Institute of Technology hosts the Future Faculty Career Exploration Program designed to fuel the future pipeline of faculty at RIT. The program furthers RIT’s goal of “Grow Your Own” future faculty by bringing in students, nearing the end of their doctoral studies, those that have completed their degrees, and junior faculty. Through this program and other networking activities, RIT has increased its URM tenured and tenure track professors from 35-78.

- CUNY’s Latino Faculty Recruitment Initiative is an example of administrative support for faculty searches. The program was created to link Latino(a) candidates to faculty positions within CUNY. Since 2009, fourteen (14) individuals identified through this program have been hired at the campuses, most on tenure track lines. Given that this model already exists within the University to attract outstanding candidates for faculty positions, it could easily be expanded to include outreach to other groups.

RETFENTION

In working with a number of colleges and universities over the last decade, Cambridge Hill Partners has found that there are generally two primary factors that contribute to retention. One is the level of institutional support for junior faculty on the tenure track, i.e. clear communications and access to needed information, equitable support and resource allocation for scholarship, and assistance in the form of mentoring or ancillary support such
as childcare. The other is climate, i.e. to what extent does an individual feel welcomed, part
of scholarly community, and respected, recognized, and supported by the department chair
and institution. To what degree do faculty have a sense of belonging to a community of
scholars beyond their department? To what degree do faculty report a sense of “fit”? To
what degree do URG faculty feel that their college genuinely values their differences?

Tenure and Promotion Criteria

- Study participants consistently cited concerns about the lack of clarity about the criteria
  for tenure and promotion. While there is a University policy for tenure and promotion,
  how that policy gets implemented at the departmental level is often unclear and
  inconsistent. Tenure and promotion issues include:
    - **Service** - Balancing requests for service with research, i.e. service is expected yet does
      not appear to carry the same weight as research and teaching in the tenure process.
      URM and women faculty reported feeling most burdened by service commitments,
      particularly those in departments or colleges with less diversity.

      A lack of transparency in effort and impact of service was a consistent theme
      throughout the interviews and focus groups. Women faculty and faculty of color
      report being called on for service more frequently than their White male colleagues.
      While perhaps well intended, faculty of color report being asked to serve on more
      committees than their White colleagues. Faculty of color also reported being sought
      out by more frequently by students of color for mentoring and advising. As a result,
      they described being overburdened with service commitments.

      In recent years, there is more research that indicates that women and URM faculty
      are often expected to and do provide greater service than their male and majority
      colleagues.

      At CUNY, the extent to which service counts, and the relative value of some kinds of
      service is not clear. It was noted that service really “doesn’t count” towards tenure
      or promotion. It is described as “valued,” but not valued in the formal recognition
      system.

      In addition to service expectations, insufficient support for research can also affect
      junior faculty’s success moving through the ranks.

    - **Votes for Tenure** - The practice of having associate professors vote on tenure for full
      professors is highly unusual. Given the great importance of the role of department
      chairs in search processes and the understandable desire of non-tenured professors
      to please senior faculty, many suggested that this practice be assessed to determine
      how it may affect faculty diversity and inclusion.

    - **Support** - Once the contractual release time ends and the faculty member now has a
      full teaching load, it can be difficult to produce the type of scholarship needed to be
      promoted.

Tenure and Promotion – New Hire Analysis

Working with CUNY’s Office for Recruitment and Diversity, Cambridge Hill Partners
conducted a comparison of two groups of new faculty tenure track hires. The purpose of the
study was to determine what if any inequities exist in the tenure and promotion of faculty by race/ethnicity or gender as claimed by URM and women faculty. The first group of 109 faculty were hired in 2001 and the second group of 119 faculty were hired in 2005. Data was analyzed through Fall 2010.

It is important to note that the data captured for 2005 is only for a five year period. There was a longer period for assessment of the 2001 group.

Observations by Race/Ethnicity

2001

In 2001, 109 faculty were hired of which 14 (12.8%) were Asian, 8 (7.3%) were Black/African-American, 3 (2.8%) were Hispanic/Latino(a) (not including Puerto Rican), 5 (4.6%) were Italian American, 1 (0.9%) was Unknown and 78 (71.6%) were White/Caucasian.

Asians
- Of the 14 Asians, 10 (71.4%) received tenure and all 10 (100.0%) received tenure in five years or less.
- Of the 14 Asians, 10 were (71.4%) promoted to associate professor and 7 (70.0%) of those were promoted to associate professor in five years or less; 3 (30.0%) were promoted to associate professor after five years.
- Three (30%) of the 10 were promoted to full professor.

Black/African-American
- Of the 8 Blacks/African-Americans, 4 (50.0%) received tenure and all 4 (100.0) received tenure in five years or less.
- Of the 8 Blacks/African-Americans, 1 (12.5%) was promoted to associate professor and was promoted to associate professor in five or less years.

Hispanic/Latino(a) not including Puerto Rican
- Of the 3 Hispanics/Latinos(as), 2 (66.7%) received tenure and both (100.0%) received tenure in five years or less.
- Of the Hispanics/Latinos(as), 2 (66.7%) were promoted to associate professor and both (100.0%) were promoted to associate professor in five or less years.
- One (50.0%) of the 2 was promoted to full professor.

Italian American
- Of the 5 Italian Americans, 3 (60.0%) received tenure and all 3 (100.0%) received tenure in five years or less.
- Of the 5 Italian Americans, 2 (40.0%) were promoted to associate professor and both (100%) were promoted to associate professor in five or less years.
- One (50.0%) of the 2 was promoted to full professor.

White/Caucasian
- Of the 78 Whites/Caucasians, 51 (65.4%) received tenure and 43 (84.3%) of those received tenure in five years or less; 8 (15.7%) received tenure after five years.
- Of the 78 Whites/Caucasians, 42 (53.8%) promoted to associate professor and 22 (52.4%) of those were promoted to associate professor in five years or less; 20 (47.6%) were promoted to associate professor after five years.
- Ten (19.6%) of the 51 were promoted to full professor.

Conclusions:
- Whites were hired, tenured and promoted at greater rates than URMs (71.6%, 72.9% and 73.7% compared to 22.9%, 22.9 and 22.8%).
- White/Caucasians were more likely than URMs to be promoted to associate professor in five or less years (76.9% vs. 52.4%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenured &lt;=5 years</th>
<th>Tenured &gt;5 years</th>
<th>Promoted</th>
<th>Promoted to Associate &lt;=5 years</th>
<th>Promoted to Associate &gt;5 years</th>
<th>Promoted to Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (not including Puerto Rican)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2005

In 2005, 119 faculty were hired of which 1 (0.8%) was American Indian or Alaskan Native, 21 (17.6%) were Asian, 6 (5.0%) were Black/African-American, 12 (10.1%) were Hispanic/Latino(a) (not including Puerto Rican), 4 (3.4%) were Italian American, 3 (2.5%) were Puerto Rican and 72 (60.5%) were White/Caucasian.

American Indian or Alaska Native
- The one American Indian or Alaskan Native (100.0%) received tenure in five or less years and was promoted to associate professor in five or less years.

Asians
- Of the 21 Asians, 14 (66.7%) received tenure and 13 (61.9%) of those received tenure in five years or less.
- Of the 21 Asians, 8 (38.1%) were promoted to associate professor and all 8 (100.0%) were promoted to associate professor in five years or less.
- One (12.5%) was promoted to full professor.

Black/African-American
- Of the 6 Blacks/African-Americans, 5 (83.3%) received tenure and received tenure in five or less years.
- Of the 6 Blacks/African-Americans, 3 (50.0%) were promoted to associate professor and
all 3 (100.0%) were promoted to associate professor in five or less years.

**Hispanic/Latino(a) not including Puerto Rican**
- Of the 12 Hispanics/Latinos(as), 10 (83.3%) received tenure and received tenure in five or less years.
- Of the 12 Hispanics/Latinos(as), 9 (75.0%) were promoted to associate professor and all 9 (100.0%) were promoted to associate professor in five years or less.

**Italian American**
- Of the 4 Italian Americans, 3 (75.0%) received tenure and received tenure in five or less years.
- Of the 4 Italian Americans, 3 (75.0%) were promoted to associate professor and both (100.0%) were promoted to associate professor in five or less years.

**Puerto Rican**
- Of the 3 Puerto Ricans, 3 (100.0%) received tenure and received tenure in five or less years.
- Of the 3 Puerto Ricans, 1 (33.3%) was promoted to associate professor in five or less years.

**White/Caucasian**
- Of the 72 Whites/Caucasians, 53 (73.6%) received tenure and 46 (86.8%) of those received tenure in five or less years.
- Of the 72 Whites/Caucasians, 31 (43.1%) were promoted to associate professor and 29 (93.5%) of those were promoted to associate professor in five or less years; 2 (6.5%) were promoted to associate professor after five years.

**Conclusions:**
- Whites were hired, tenured and promoted at greater rates than URMs (60.5%, 59.6% and 56.4% compared to 36.1%, 37.1 and 40.0%), although the gap was narrower than in 2001.
- URMs were slightly more likely than White/Caucasians to be promoted to associate professor in less than five years (100.0% vs. 93.5%).
- The 2005 group included more URM hires than the 2001 group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tenured &lt;= 5 years</th>
<th>Tenured &gt; 5 years</th>
<th>Promoted &lt;=5 years</th>
<th>Promoted to Associate &gt;5 years</th>
<th>Promoted to Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (not including Puerto Rican)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations by Gender

2001

In 2001 109 faculty were hired of which 54 (49.5%) were male and 55 (50.5%) were female.

- Of the 54 men 36 (66.7%) received tenure and 34 (94.4%) received tenure in five years or less.
- Of the 54 men, 32 (59.3%) were promoted and 14 (43.8%) were promoted to associate professor in five years or less; 18 (56.3%) were promoted to associate professor after five years.
- Eleven (34.4%) of the 32 were promoted to full professor.
- In comparison, of the 55 women 34 (61.8%) received tenure and 28 (82.3%) received tenure in five years or less.
- Of the 55 women, 25 (45.5%) were promoted and 20 (80.0%) were promoted to associate professor in five years or less; five (20%) were promoted to associate professor after five years.
- Four (16.0%) of the 25 women were promoted to full professor.

Conclusions:

- Men (49.5%) and women (50.5%) were hired proportionally and received tenure accordingly, however, there were differences in promotion.
- Men were more likely than women to be promoted (56.1% vs. 43.9%); men were less likely than women to be promoted in five years or less (43.8% vs. 80.0%).
- Men were more likely than women to be appointed to full professor (34.4% vs. 16.0%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenured &lt;= 5 years</th>
<th>Tenured &gt; 5 years</th>
<th>Promoted</th>
<th>Promoted to Associate in 5 &lt;= years</th>
<th>Promoted to Associate &gt; 5 years</th>
<th>Promoted to Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2005

In 2005 119 faculty were hired of which 53 (44.5%) were male and 66 (55.5%) were female.

- Of the 53 men, 37 (69.8%) received tenure and 33 (89.2%) received tenure in five years or less.
- Of the 53 men, 24 (45.3%) were promoted to associate professor and 24 (100.0%) were promoted to associate professor in five years or less.
- In comparison, of the 66 women, 52 (78.8%) received tenure and 43 (82.7%) received tenure in five years or less.
- Of the 66 women, 31 (47.0%) were promoted to associate professor and 29 (93.5%) were...
promoted in five years or less; 2 (6.5%) were promoted to associate professor after five years.

- One woman (3.2%) was promoted to full professor. Note: Data was only available to Fall 2010 so more promotions are expected for both men and women.

**Conclusions:**

- Although more women were hired than men (55.5% compared to 44.5%) there were differences in promotion and tenure.
- Women were more likely than men to receive tenure (58.4% vs. 41.6%).
- Men are less likely than women to be promoted (43.6% vs. 56.4%); men were more likely than women to be promoted in five years or less (100.0% vs. 93.5%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenured &lt;= 5 years</th>
<th>Tenured &gt; 5 years</th>
<th>Promoted</th>
<th>Promoted to Associate &lt;= 5 years</th>
<th>Promoted to Associate &gt; 5 years</th>
<th>Promoted to Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Climate**

Campus and departmental climate for diversity and inclusion is an important factor in recruiting and retaining URG members. Study participants often cited fostering an atmosphere of fairness, equality and inclusion as the foundation for satisfaction. The following sections cover highlights from the CUNY Faculty Diversity Climate Survey and the COACHE survey.

**CUNY Faculty Diversity Climate Survey**

A survey of full-time faculty was conducted in May 2011. The online survey was designed with input from the Diversity Study Steering Committee, University Office of Recruitment and Diversity, and Cambridge Hill Partners. The survey instrument was reviewed by the Central Office Institutional Review Board. There were 1,312 completed surveys out of a pool of 6,500 valid email addresses.

The survey focused on questions around the following topics: satisfaction, inclusion/community, collegial interaction, fairness/consistency, hiring process, tenure, promotion, diversity programs, and work-life. Demographic information utilized for purposes of this report include: gender, institution type, length of full-time employment, race/ethnicity, and rank. Faculty were asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement using a 7-point likert scale (1=Strongly agree 2=Moderately agree 3=Slightly agree 4=Neither agree nor disagree 5=Slightly Disagree 6=Moderately disagree 7=Strongly disagree).

All data was reported in aggregate to protect the confidentiality of respondents. All comparisons reported meet statistical significance or probability less than 0.05 and are
found in Appendix K.

Faculty reported overall satisfaction with their experience at CUNY regardless of identity. Comparisons by gender found no significant differences. Below are the statistically significant differences based on race/ethnicity.

Survey Highlights:
- URMs are more favorable to faculty diversity compared to their White/Caucasian counterparts.
- Faculty with 20 years or less of service believe more strongly in faculty diversity.
- URMs feel less valued than their White/Caucasian counterparts.
- Asians feel their department is more welcoming and that their chair is approachable as compared to other groups.
- Lecturers and full professors are more satisfied with working at CUNY.
- Graduate Center/Honors College/Professional College faculty are most satisfied with their experience at CUNY.
- Faculty with 21 or more years are more satisfied with their experience and career at CUNY, feel welcomed and valued in their departments and colleges, and do not believe faculty are made to feel unwelcomed based upon aspects of their identity (e.g. sexual orientation).
- Associate and assistant professors lack clarity about the criteria for tenure and promotion.
- Full professors report better understanding the requirements for tenure and promotion and believe the requirements are applied uniformly.
- Faculty with 21 or more years report better understanding the requirements for tenure and promotion compared to newer faculty.
- Lecturers, assistant and associate professors more strongly agreed than full professors that faculty diversity brings different perspectives into the department and results in a better educational experience for students.
- URMs more strongly agreed than Whites/Caucasians that faculty diversity results in better educational experience for students.

COACHE Survey
A summary of the COACHE Survey of tenure track faculty at the senior colleges* prepared by the CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment compared differences in the weighted average of responses of white to minority and male to female faculty.

COACHE Survey - Minority Versus White Tenure Track Faculty
An analysis of weighted averages of COACHE survey responses comparing White and Minority results shows differences based on race. Twenty-two (22) items were rated lower by Minority tenure track faculty than White tenure track faculty indicating a lower level of satisfaction with policies and practices.

- The survey included 11 questions within the work/home category. Eight (8) were rated lower by Minority faculty than White faculty indicating less satisfaction on issues including “stop the clock,” e.g. policies that provide a break in time to tenure without penalty for work family issues, institution and colleagues make having and raising children and tenure track compatibility, spousal and partner hiring program, childcare, modified duties for parental or other family reasons part-time tenure track position.

- The survey included 16 questions in total in the climate, culture and collegiality category. 7 were rated lower by Minority faculty than White faculty. These questions included - amount of personal and professional interaction with tenured and pre-tenured colleagues, participation in governance of department and institution, and interest of tenured faculty in junior faculty’s professional development.

- Minority faculty differed from White faculty in ratings of whether the Chief Academic Officer cares about the quality of life for pre-tenure faculty, compensation, tuition waivers, influence over focus of research, expectation for finding external funding, professional assistance in obtaining grants, and discretion over course content.

COACHE Survey - Female Versus Male Tenure Track Faculty

- There were differences in how male and female tenure track faculty rated satisfaction. Highlighted below are questions with at least a .25 difference in the responses between women and men. These questions primarily related to “Work and Home” and “Nature of the Work: Research”.

  - Women faculty indicated a lower level of satisfaction than men on the following: elder care, child care, part-time tenure track, modified duties for parental and family leave, ability to balance between professional and personal time and the institution makes having children and the tenure track compatible.

  - Conversely women rated the following work and home questions higher than men indicating a greater level of satisfaction: paid/unpaid personal time, colleagues make having and raising children and tenure-track compatible

  - The following “nature of work” research” questions were also rated lower by women faculty: amount of time to conduct research, research services, professional assistance in obtaining grants, and expectations for finding external funding.

  *COACHE is only open to four-year colleges and universities, not community colleges.

Mentoring

Mentoring received considerable attention during the interviews, focus groups, strategy forums, and discussions with the Working Group. Participants noted that all junior faculty on the tenure track need support and guidance from a strong mentor. A number of faculty and
administrators described significant efforts at their colleges to provide mentoring for junior faculty. In these cases, mentoring of junior faculty is considered a priority and academic leaders play an active role.

- Although most CUNY colleges have some mentoring programs, faculty participating in focus groups reported a wide range of experience with their mentors. In Spring 2011, some faculty indicated that they had yet to meet their appointed mentors. Others described satisfying and important relationships with senior faculty who had taken them on “unofficially” in mentoring relationships.

- There seems to be a continuum of activity and support at CUNY under the term “mentoring.” For example, one URM faculty member reported being “sponsored” by a senior faculty member who invited her to collaborate on research and is actively involved in overseeing her grant applications. Another URM faculty member reported receiving invaluable advice from a senior faculty member who was “unofficially” her mentor, including which invitations to accept or decline and when to speak up or remain quiet.

- At CUNY’s Baruch College, the School of Public Affairs (SPA), the Weissman School of Arts and Sciences (WSAS), and Zicklin School of Business have mentoring programs tailored to the distinct needs of their respective schools and faculty.
  - For example at SPA, each junior faculty member chooses (or, in absence of a stated preference, is assigned) a senior faculty mentor with research interests as close to those of the junior member as possible. The senior faculty mentor serves as a resource on issues from teaching to publication.

- An example of a University-wide mentoring program is the Penn State Senior Faculty Mentor Network that provides a variety of supportive services to tenure track faculty members belonging to underrepresented racial/ethnic groups to facilitate attainment of tenure and promotion. Services offered include: mentoring; individual consultations regarding progress toward tenure and promotion, including review of dossiers; advice regarding vitae maintenance and development; supplemental travel support to attend conferences; and activities to promote a sense of community.

Microinequities

A major concern of URG and GLBTQ faculty were microinequities which occur when individuals are singled out, overlooked, ignored, or otherwise discounted based on unchangeable characteristic such as race, gender or sexual orientation. Faculty reported hearing derogatory comments based on their identity. Given that these faculty are on the tenure track, they often believe it is too risky to directly address this treatment with their department chairs. Additionally, some faculty do not view the Affirmative Action Officer as a confidential resource to address their concerns.

- At times, stereotyping can occur with teaching assignments. A number of faculty reported being requested to teach classes based on some aspect of their identity despite their own limited experience or expertise in the subject matter, e.g. foreign languages or ethnic studies.

- Many faculty suggested that department chairs have the opportunity to enhance their ability to foster a climate “inclusiveness and civility.”
• As part of a 2010 study, *Invisible Barriers to the Success of Women and Minority Faculty*, conducted by Deborah A. Ballam, Associate Provost for Women’s Policy Initiatives, The Ohio State University, male and female academic psychologists were sent identical vitae with half receiving vitae with a woman’s name and half receiving vitae with a man’s name. When asked to indicate whether they would recommend hiring the person, both male and female evaluators were significantly more likely to hire the candidate when they believed the person was a man. This study is one of many that continue to illustrate the ways in which unconscious bias and stereotyping can impact URG faculty.

**Faculty Orientation**

A number of faculty described a lack of adequate orientation for new faculty, particularly at the department level. While all new faculty participate in some form of orientation, it appears that how faculty are oriented varies widely by college.

**Faculty Visibility and Recognition**

Some colleges report working hard to promote visibility for URM faculty, i.e. showcasing work, selecting for influential and visible committees, and supporting grant development. However, many faculty members reported experiencing more of a “sink or swim” experience and expressed that more needed to be done to promote visibility for all faculty.

**Community of Scholars**

Given its size and location, CUNY has a unique competitive advantage to create communities of scholars. These communities can prevent or reduce the isolation that often contributes to URG faculty’s decision to leave the University. Some efforts have been successful in bringing together scholars representing a particular discipline from across CUNY institutions. These events seem to have been positively received and effective in forging relationships as well as creating a sense of belonging to a “community of scholars” across disciplines.

Consistently, faculty and administrators spoke of the need for more opportunities to bring together faculty from across campuses. This is particularly important for URG faculty who may feel isolated within their own departments and colleges. The University’s Faculty Fellowship Publications Program (FFPP) was cited as an example of a successful cross campus initiative. The FFPP assists junior faculty with the design and execution of high quality scholarly publications. Specifically, it brings untenured faculty together with senior faculty mentors who conduct seminars and serve as writing facilitators and counselors to their junior colleagues. Over the years, the FFPP has included over 300 female faculty members and over 200 faculty members from underrepresented groups, including Italian Americans. Past participants have rated the opportunity to meet and develop professional relationships with colleagues from across the University as the program’s most enduring benefit.

Some external examples of community building across disciplines follow:

• University of Virginia sponsors the *Excellence in Diversity Fellows Program* that offers incoming junior faculty one-year Fellowships to help them develop productive long-term careers at the University of Virginia. In addition to other objectives, there is an emphasis on initiatives that:
Promote a peer-level support network and serious intellectual discourse among a diverse group of faculty members; and

Establish and maintain an environment in which junior faculty, particularly those from diverse backgrounds, develop a sense of belonging to a community, not only within individual academic units but also to the University as a whole.

Ohio State University has undertaken a program to increase diversity and address institutional impediments to the recruitment and retention of faculty of color in the humanities. The program includes cluster hiring, intensive mentoring and professional development of junior faculty by senior faculty mentors. Junior faculty remain with the same mentor for four years. Mentors receive training including three workshops per year. This cohort prepares for publications, addresses issues of pedagogy, and participates in networking. In the first year, these hires have no service requirements. All 10 faculty in the first cohort received tenure. The program has been in place for 5 years. Overall the program has resulted in 23 tenured faculty.

Childcare

Given the pressures on junior faculty with families and the expense of living in New York City, child care can affect retention. Access to quality, on-campus childcare was noted frequently, particularly by female faculty. A second priority articulated by female faculty is proximity to off-campus affordable childcare.

Compensation

It was consistently noted that faculty compensation is a key factor related to retention. There were numerous examples cited in which junior faculty and tenured faculty have left the University for a higher salary. It was also acknowledged that CUNY, as a unionized, public institution operates within considerable constraints related to compensation. Among academic leaders, there is apprehension about using salary above base to attract and retain individuals who would then earn more than current faculty.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Presidents, Provosts, Deans and Department Chairs

A major concern of study participants was the importance of visible leadership from presidents, provosts, deans, and department chairs in advancing diversity and inclusion on campuses. Most faculty participating in focus groups expressed the belief that senior leaders’ involvement is the number one factor affecting the success of faculty diversity efforts. It is reported that some CUNY leaders have been more effective and persistent while others have been more disengaged. In the end, all agree that leaders discussing and addressing diversity challenges and opportunities will directly affect CUNY’s success. For instance, many referenced the willingness of academic leaders to intervene, i.e. suspend searches when a diverse pool of applicants is not achieved.

The lack of diversity among those in academic leadership positions was routinely cited as evidence of the need for diversity at all levels of the University. The following charts provide demographic information about academic leaders in 2011.
Academic leaders were determined by the individual campuses and include: Provosts (associates and assistants), Deans (associates and assistants), and Administrators (associates and assistants).

*Additional charts by campus in Appendix L.*
Performance Management Process/Accountability

While there is a diversity goal in CUNY’s Performance Management Process (PMP), it is widely reported that there is limited accountability for the achievement of diversity goals. A review of college specific plans on the website indicates that relatively few colleges have any meaningful indicators for the faculty diversity goal. Additionally, there is a lack of consistency in how the goals are established and articulated, which then makes it difficult to measure progress. While the PMP is used to evaluate the Presidents, most faculty hiring decisions are made at the department level and considered a faculty responsibility. The academy values academic freedom, autonomy and shared governance and CUNY’s structure reflects this tradition of decentralized authority. Any discussion regarding accountability for diversity efforts inevitably brings up concerns about faculty resistance to centralized goals.

Study participants would like to see the PMP used more effectively to hold academic leaders and faculty accountable for achieving diversity and inclusion goals.

College Based Strategic Plans

- Related to PMP, many faculty and administrators would like to see individual colleges develop their own diversity and inclusion strategic plans. Given the decentralized nature of CUNY, it was noted that a CUNY (central) top down approach will not work. The Inclusive Excellence Program was often cited as an example of how this approach does not work at CUNY. While some colleges embraced this Program, namely the College of Staten Island, most of colleges did not. It was suggested that if each institution developed its own strategic diversity plan, the colleges would be more likely to implement the plan’s recommendations.
The University should develop the overarching vision and framework and let the individual colleges develop strategic plans that are aligned with the University’s vision. Individual plans are best suited to addressing the distinct issues and opportunities that a particular college needs to address in order to advance diversity and inclusion efforts on their campus.

Incentives

It was noted that CUNY’s central administration and college level leadership should provide incentives to departments for investing in diversity and inclusion efforts. The types of diversity efforts would be agreed to in partnership with the college’s administration and presumably would support the college’s diversity strategic plan. These incentives could include such things as additional lines, funding for recruitment, administrative support, access to special grant funding, etc. Given CUNY’s limited resources, the University should consider funding these incentives with a combination of its own funds and grants and private donations. Many other public institutions have successfully used this approach.

In researching other institutions, awarding service credits to faculty for their efforts in identifying faculty candidates and partnering with other institutions to develop diverse pipelines is an inexpensive and cost effective way of engaging faculty.

Accountability – Additional External Practices

- *Breakthrough Advances in Faculty Diversity* as well as best practices research conducted for this study suggest two primary strategies for accountability - planning and monitoring.
  - To be meaningful, planning must happen at the college and department levels. This kind of “bottom up” planning requires significant effort to establish a transparent process that is well understood and supported. The benefit of college level planning for diversity and inclusion is that it is sustainable, becomes part of the culture, and serves as the most effective way to engage faculty and reduce resistance.
  - Monitoring can be effective as an approach to enhancing accountability and requires less effort than college level planning yet research shows that monitoring is more likely to generate faculty resistance.

Research in the abovementioned *Breakthrough* study points to college and unit specific plans as one of the most important requirements for successful faculty diversity efforts. While a University-wide Diversity and Inclusion Plan can provide an overarching framework and coherent strategic directions, by itself it will be too broad to result in goals that are meaningful at the college and budgetary unit level where execution is critical. College specific plans down to the budgetary unit level are necessary to engage provosts and/or deans, department chairs, senior faculty, and search committees.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations will best address the need to improve URG representation and strengthen the climate for diversity and inclusion across the University. These recommendations are both reasonable and attainable, but they require the Chancellery’s leadership, support, and monitoring.

A. **Definition and University Vision**

   Develop a definition and vision for diversity and inclusion that outlines aspirations and strategic directions for the University. A compelling vision with overarching strategic directions can be used to create alignment among college specific plans. Such a vision can also be used in multiple internal and external communications to reinforce CUNY’s commitment to developing and retaining a diverse faculty.

**LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

B. **Leadership - College Presidents**

   University leaders should engage presidents in moving towards a new model focused on diversity and inclusion. This shift broadens the focus beyond head counts of URG faculty to include a heightened focus on climate and culture, on practices and policies that support a sense of belonging for all faculty, and rewards to academic officers for increasing retention efforts as well as diversifying the faculty.

C. **University Wide Diversity Council**

   Establish a high level University-Wide Diversity Council that provides oversight and coordination of diversity and inclusion efforts. The primary role of the Council would be to facilitate the systematic exchange of information, strategies, and recommendations relating to representation, recruitment, retention, climate and measures for evaluating progress. The University Affirmative Action Committee has served an important function by assisting the University achieve its compliance responsibilities, but does not have the scope of responsibility or membership to effectively provide oversight and coordination.

   The Diversity Council can serve as a platform for bringing together high-level academic and administrative officers and faculty to develop consistent external and internal messages and coordinate activities across the academic and student life areas.

   Cambridge Hill Partners has found that University Diversity Councils are more effective with a clear mandate, level of authority and accountability to the Chancellor or a sub-committee of the Board.

D. **Shared Leadership**

   1. **Provosts and/or Deans – Leadership**

      Other institutions noted for effective practices, report that Provosts and/or Deans play a critical role in moving an institution from planning to execution of diversity initiatives. They are also positioned as key players in reinforcing the commitment of
campus presidents. Provosts and/or Deans should be more engaged in oversight of faculty searches and work collaboratively with the Affirmative Action Officers.

2. College Level Councils

Encourage the colleges to revitalize, recharge and, if needed, rename their college-wide affirmative action councils with representation from administration, faculty and students. College-based councils could assist in developing campus-based strategic plans as well as recommendations for a range of initiatives in support of diversity and inclusion efforts.

Having diversity councils can complement the efforts of affirmative action offices at the colleges. It was noted consistently in the interviews that the affirmative action function (seen primarily as compliance) needs to be balanced with a focus on articulating the value of diversity and inclusion to higher education.

3. College Based Diversity StrategicPlans

Develop college specific diversity strategic plans that address faculty, staff and students. Given the decentralized nature of CUNY and distinct differences among the colleges, it is recommended that each college develop a diversity strategic plan with measures that can be used to assess progress over time. These strategic plans should be aligned with CUNY’s overall university diversity vision and strategic directions.

E. Indicators of Success

Define metrics of success beyond representation with additional focus on retention, promotion rates, and climate reported on by gender, race, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, and disability. A University-coordinated exit interview program is critical to gathering substantive information on why faculty leave CUNY.

RECRUITMENT

F. Support for Search Committees

1) Search Committee Education - Adopt best practices in educating search committees. Through HR and Diversity Officers at all campuses, consult with and advise search committees on effective practices that can result in more qualified diverse candidate pools. This can include providing skills development, information resources, e.g. associations, conferences, and, possibly, limited financial support. The University Dean of Recruitment and Diversity can play a pivotal role in supporting HR and Diversity Officers in their consulting efforts. The goal is to help colleges build capacity over time to consistently run effective search committee processes.

○ An example of search committee support is the Administrators Search Tool Kit at UCLA. The toolkit provides a comprehensive set of guidelines for faculty searches.

http://www.faculty.diversity.ucla.edu/search/searchtoolkit/docs/AdministratorsSearchToolkit.pdf
National research on best practices reported in the 2008 Breakthrough Advances in Faculty Diversity Report highlights four critical elements are required for highest levels of effectiveness in education of search committees:

1. Making the Case for Faculty Action - University launches academically oriented educational effort to cultivate faculty commitment to recruiting diverse candidates
2. Resourcing the Recruiting Effort - University creates dedicated recruiting roles for faculty and non-faculty, invests in “upstream” recruiting activities
3. Hardwiring Faculty Search Oversight - Senior individual with strong support of dean closely reviews and (when appropriate) intervenes in individual faculty searches
4. Spotlighting Diversity Performance - Highly transparent planning process holds colleges accountable for following through on concrete action steps reference breakthrough for this section

2) Consulting Services. Offer consulting services through the HR and Diversity Offices on each campus with a focus on working with Provosts and/or Deans and department chairs on issues related to recruitment and retention. Given the wide variation of how deans and department chairs are likely to view diversity and its level of importance, a consultative tailored approach to colleges and departments will be important. This will allow HR and Diversity Officers to work in partnership with deans, department chairs, and affirmative action officers in ways that increase shared knowledge, an understanding of options, and focuses on what is most needed for the college and department.

G. Offers in a Competitive Environment

1) Clarity About Offers - Engage Presidents and Provosts in dialogue to discuss the realities of competition for faculty. There is confusion and ambiguity among academic leaders regarding what competitive strategies are legally available to them and what competitive strategies are approved by the administration.

2) Competitive Tool Kit - Develop a tool kit of creative options to attract, recruit and hire diverse faculty. These options should address the competitive disadvantages of NYC and CUNY such as cost of housing, lack of campus based child care, spousal hiring policies, current teaching loads, and limited start up funds for research. These options should also maximize the competitive advantages of CUNY’s mission, demographics, and size. Competitive advantages could include options for dual appointments through the Graduate Center, access to doctoral students and graduate students to support research, and access to senior faculty advisors.

A University-sponsored Target of Opportunity Program that provides funding on a competitive basis for activities that further University goals such as hiring underrepresented groups, spousal/domestic partner hiring, and hiring nationally/internationally recognized faculty.
RETENTION

H. Mentoring

1) Review Existing Mentoring Programs - Review existing mentoring programs underway within CUNY colleges to identify effective practices. For instance, there are some CUNY colleges that identify new faculty who are experiencing professional challenges and the Provost meets with the faculty member’s chair to discuss ways to assist the faculty member.

2) Tailored Mentoring Programs - Develop three CUNY models using internal practices in combination with practices from other institutions - one for professional schools, one for senior colleges and one for community colleges. These mentoring models would focus “on the road to successful teaching, research and tenure” that can be adapted and tailored to meet the specific needs of different colleges and departments. These models would include evaluation and assessment components to support continued development of the model.

I. Share CUNY’s Internal Best Practices

1) Conduct a comprehensive review of effective practices occurring on CUNY campuses, including costs, program components, participation and results. Ideally, continually document and inventory these practices within the Office of the Dean for Recruitment and Diversity. With this information on record, the Dean’s Office can be the conduit for sharing effective practices across schools and departments.

2) Sponsored by the Dean of Recruitment and Diversity, hold a periodic CUNY Diversity Conference. The University Diversity Council in partnership with the Dean could develop conference themes and content areas.

J. Resource Support and Incentives

1) College Based Strategic Plans - Support diversity and inclusion strategic planning at the college level. Support to campuses could be provided through the Office of the Dean for Recruitment and Diversity.

2) Support Local Innovation - Build on the University’s Diversity Projects Development Fund by creating other funds needed to support a range of diversity initiatives within the colleges. Knowing that the level of funding will be significantly constrained by current budget realities, funds would be used to pilot programs, implement strategies underway within a college, and disseminate results.

3) Fund Local Initiatives – As CUNY already does with the Diversity Projects Development Fund, continue to use incentives to fund campus efforts. This could include a target of opportunity program.

4) Identify Outside Funding Sources – Develop a database of funding sources for faculty diversity and inclusion efforts to be housed in the Office of the Dean for Recruitment and Diversity.

K. Faculty Networks, Connections and Sense of Belonging

Strengthen the sense of belonging to a scholarly community by expanding on existing forums for bringing faculty together to share scholarly work and network with others.
Forums are particularly effective for reducing the isolation that many URG faculty may experience in their departments and colleges.

L. Post Tenure Mentoring – Leadership Development

Establish a post-tenure Fellows program designed to identify future academic leaders and provide them with mentoring needed to progress to academic and administrative leadership positions. This strategy can increase retention of post-tenure URG faculty while also providing a pipeline to ensure diversity for future academic leadership positions.

An example of a successful post-tenure faculty mentoring programs is the University of Pennsylvania’s Penta Fellowship program. This program allows faculty to develop strong relationships with academic leaders and senior faculty.

M. Fostering Culture of Inclusion

Implement a University-wide Inclusive and Respectful Workplace Program that covers the following areas: cross-cultural communication, leading and managing diverse departments, sexual orientation in the workplace, disability issues in the workplace, and search committee strategies for conducting equitable searches. Consistent messages about inclusion help to promote the supportive and welcoming environment that is key to faculty retention.

CONCLUSIONS

The City University of New York is at a critical juncture. While the University’s URG representation is good, without increased recruitment and retention of URG members the University will be unable to maintain, much less increase, diversity within the professoriate. This study is an opportunity for CUNY to strengthen its practices and develop innovative strategies to continue to be a national leader in the area of faculty diversity.

However, recruitment is one piece of the equation. Retention efforts, applied equitably to all faculty, will improve the climate for everyone and lead to greater satisfaction for all faculty. That is not to say that the University will not have to develop targeted programs for URGs. It is simply a reflection of the fact that, generally, all faculty need the same things to thrive: support for research, mentorship, collegiality, and a sense of belonging. Retention is critical both for morale and also for financial reasons, as faculty replacement costs tend to be much higher than retention costs. Given the current fiscal climate, retention of junior faculty is of paramount importance.
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Appendix A

Diversity Study Steering Committee Description of Duties and Membership

The Diversity Study Steering Committee, appointed by Chancellor Matthew Goldstein, oversaw the study and made recommendations for enhancing the University’s diversity and compliance activities. The committee worked with the Dean for Recruitment and Diversity, Jennifer S. Rubain, Esq., and with the consulting firm Cambridge Hill Partners, a firm with many years of experience in the areas of diversity and strategic innovation in higher education.

Chair
Joyce Moy, JD
Executive Director of the CUNY Asian American/Asian Research Institute

Members

Curtis Kendrick
University Dean for Libraries and Information Resources

Lisa Staiano-Coico
President
The City College

Peter Lipke
Chair
Department of Biology
Brooklyn College

Clarence Taylor
Professor
Mildred and George Weissman School of Arts and Sciences
Baruch College

Gustavo Lopez
Professor
Department of Chemistry
Lehman College

Arlene Torres
Director of the CUNY Latino Faculty Initiative
Associate Professor of Africana, Puerto Rican and Latino Studies, Hunter College

Tomás D. Morales
President
College of Staten Island

Cathy A. Trower (Consultant)
COACHE
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

Lisandro Pérez
Chair, Department of Latin American and Latina/o Studies
John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Carolyn Williams
President
Bronx Community College
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COACHE is the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education which is housed at Harvard University’s Graduate School of Education. This consortium of over 160 colleges, universities and systems across North America is committed to making the academic workplace more attractive and equitable for faculty. COACHE administers the Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey annually.

GLBTQ stands for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer/Questioning

IPEDS is the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. It is a system of interrelated surveys conducted annually by the U.S. Department’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). IPEDS gathers information from every college, university, and technical and vocational institution that participates in the federal student financial aid programs.

URG stands for underrepresented group and includes: Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino(a), Italian Americans, and Women.

URM stands for underrepresented minority and includes: Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino(a).
Interviews
Cambridge Hill Partners interviewed stakeholders from around the University. The interviews focused on personal observations and assessment of the University’s challenges and opportunities in terms of increasing the representation of underrepresented groups and for strengthening the climate for diversity and inclusion across the University. See below for the list of interviewees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Trustee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Philip Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Wellington Chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Valerie Lancaster Beal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Kathleen Pesile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Carol Robles-Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Charlie Shorter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chancellery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor Allan Dobrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor Alexandra Logue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice Chancellor Jay Hershenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor Ginger Waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor Gillian Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Kelly - Graduate School and University Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Pérez- Borough of Manhattan Community College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provosts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James McCarthy - Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita Rabinowitz - Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stellar - Queens College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Suss - Kingsborough Community College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Affirmative Action Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College/Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilen Chan, Esq.</td>
<td>New York City College of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Mason-Kinsey, Esq.</td>
<td>Brooklyn College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Human Resources Directors / Labor Designees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College/Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liza Larios, Dean of Human Resources/ Labor Designee</td>
<td>Queensborough Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Washington, Human Resources Director</td>
<td>Lehman College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College/Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donna Chirico, Associate Prof. of Psychology and Chair of Behavioral Science</td>
<td>York College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandi E. Cooper, Chairperson of University Faculty Senate</td>
<td>College of Staten Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Cunningham, Prof. of Africana Studies and Chair</td>
<td>Brooklyn College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College/Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Tamburri</td>
<td>John D. Calandra Italian American Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Directors of Institutes/Centers/Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College/Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laird W. Bergad, Director, Center for Latin American</td>
<td>Lehman College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot Dawes, Director, CUNY Black Male Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Hernández, Director of the CUNY Dominican Studies</td>
<td>City College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Meléndez, Director of the Center for Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Hunter College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Moy, Executive Director, Asian American/Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene Torres, Director, CUNY Latino Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>Hunter College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Working Group Description of Duties and Membership

A Working Group was established to focus on three key areas: Recruitment, Retention, and Accountability.

To that end, the Working Group:

1. Reviewed and discussed University and campus practices, initiatives, and programs as they related to these areas.
2. Considered best practices at CUNY and peer institutions.
3. Developed recommendations to bridge the gap between current practices and best practices overall.

Members

Kitty Bateman
Associate Professor
Basic Educational Skills
Queensborough Community College

Kofi Benefo
Assistant Professor
Sociology Department
Lehman College

Albert E. Croker
Chair
Department of Statistics and Computer Information Systems
Baruch College

Olga Dais, Esq.
Executive Director of Compliance and Legal Affairs
York College

Danielle Dimitrov, Esq.
Affirmative Action Officer
College of Staten Island

Serafina Dolan
Human Resources Director
Hunter College

Pamela Edwards
Law Professor
CUNY School of Law

Karl Botchway
Associate Professor
African American Studies
New York City College of Technology

Tamara Mose Brown
Assistant Professor
Sociology Department
Brooklyn College

Sandra Castellanos
Instructor
Dental Hygiene
Hostos Community College
Joanne Edey-Rhodes
Lecturer
Africana and Puerto Rican/Latino Studies
Hunter College

Soribel Genao
Assistant Professor
Education and Community Programs
Queens College

Sheila H. Gillams
Assistant Professor
Philosophy and Religious Studies
Medgar Evers College

Mario Kelly
Professor/Executive Officer
Educational Psychology
Graduate Center

Brian Kerr
Acting Affirmative Action Officer
Queensborough Community College

Liza Larios
Dean for Human Resources and Labor Relations
Queensborough Community College

Natalie Mason-Kinsey, Esq.
Director of Diversity and Equity Programs
Brooklyn College

Patricia D. Mathews
Chair
Center for Ethnic Studies
Borough of Manhattan Community College

Dawn Ewing Morgan
Chief of Staff and Director of Compliance and Diversity
Lehman College

Carmen Pedrogo
Affirmative Action Officer
Baruch College

Neal Phillip
Professor
Chemistry and Chemical Technology Department
Bronx Community College

Felipe Pimentel
Assistant Professor
Behavioral and Social Sciences
Hostos Community College

Angel Rivera
Affirmative Action Officer
Kingsborough Community College

Edith Rivera
Affirmative Action Officer
Graduate Center

Elizabeth Robinson
Executive Director of Human Resources
Baruch College

John T. Rose
Dean of Diversity and Compliance
Hunter College

Cynthia Rountree, Esq.
Director of Compliance and Diversity Programs
Queens College
Brandis Ruffin  
Human Resources Coordinator  
Queens College

Minerva Santos  
Associate Professor  
Language and Cognition  
Hostos Community College

Andrew Smallwood  
Assistant Professor  
Social Science  
Borough of Manhattan Community College

Iyana Titus, Esq.  
Affirmative Action Officer  
Borough of Manhattan Community College

Kyoko Toyama  
Assistant Professor  
College Discovery Department  
LaGuardia Community College

Vanessa K. Valdes  
Assistant Professor  
Foreign Languages and Literature  
City College

Tshombe Walker  
Assistant Professor  
African American Studies  
New York City College of Technology

Edisa Weeks  
Assistant Professor  
Drama, Theater, and Dance  
Queens College

Xiaodan Zhang  
Assistant Professor/Sociology Program Coordinator  
Social Science  
York College

Ying Zhu  
Professor  
Media Culture  
College of Staten Island
Appendix E
Focus Group Description

As part of the University's Diversity Study, the consulting firm Cambridge Hill Partners facilitated a number of focus groups to identify a range of ideas and actions in support of an inclusive, respectful, and supportive workplace for all groups at the University. The groups also helped to understand if experiences differed based on aspects of identity.

Focus groups were organized around the following identities:

Asian
Black/African-American
Caucasian/White/Jewish*
GLBTQ
Hispanic/Latino(a)
Individuals with Disabilities
Italian American
Male
Female

* The Jewish group was added because a number of faculty, who would be categorized as White for federal reporting purposes, expressed that a Jewish category would better represent their identity group.
Appendix F
Meeting with Deans and Provosts

Cambridge Hill Partners facilitated meetings with campus Deans and Provosts to solicit their feedback on the study’s preliminary findings and to develop a framework for removing impediments to increasing faculty diversity and fostering inclusion.

Deans’ Meeting

Timothy Alborn
Dean
Lehman College

Marzie Jafari
Dean
Lehman College

Edward Jarroll
Dean
Lehman College

Joseph Barba
Dean
City College

Liza Larios
Dean
Queensborough Community College

Kristin Maynard
Director
School of Professional Studies

Arthur Corradetti
Associate Dean
Queensborough Community College

Jason Finkelstein
Assistant Dean
Bronx Community College

Jeffrey Peck
Dean
Baruch College

Toni Gifford
Associate Director
New Community College

Vita Rabinowitz
Provost and Vice President
Hunter College

Sherryl Browne Graves
Acting Dean
Hunter College

Deborah Shanley
Dean
Brooklyn College

Robert Greenberg
Acting Dean
Hunter College

Gaoyin Qian
Associate Dean
Lehman College

Barbara Grumet
Dean
NYCCT

Carlyle Van Thompson
Interim Dean
Medgar Evers College

Louise Hainline
Dean
Brooklyn College
Provosts’ Meeting

Penny Andrews  
Associate Dean  
CUNY School of Law

Bonne August  
Provost and Vice President  
New York City College of Technology

Jane Bowers  
Provost and Senior Vice President  
John Jay College

Sadie Bragg  
Provost and Senior Vice President  
Borough of Manhattan Community College

Jason Finkelstein  
Assistant Dean  
Bronx Community College

William Fritz  
Provost and Senior Vice President  
College of Staten Island

Ivelaw Griffith  
Provost and Senior Vice President  
York College

Ernest Hart  
Acting Administrative Officer  
Queensborough Community College

Howard Johnson  
Provost and Senior Vice President  
Medgar Evers College

Peter Katopes  
Vice President  
LaGuardia Community College

James McCarthy  
Provost and Senior Vice President  
Baruch College

George Otte  
Associate Dean  
School of Professional Studies

Mary Papazian  
Provost and Senior Vice President  
Lehman College

Vita Rabinowitz  
Provost and Vice President  
Hunter College

John Rose  
Dean  
Hunter College

Stuart Suss  
Provost and Vice President  
Kingsborough Community College

William Tramontano  
Provost and Vice President  
Brooklyn College
Appendix G
Diversity Strategy Sessions

The Strategy Sessions, facilitated by Cambridge Hill Partners, were open to all faculty and provided an opportunity for faculty to raise issues, offer ideas, and help set the future direction of diversity activities. The sessions were held in every borough to allow as much participation as possible. There were approximately one hundred fifty (150) attendees at the Strategy Sessions.

Strategy Sessions by Borough:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>May 3, 2011</td>
<td>City College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>May 4, 2011</td>
<td>Brooklyn College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>May 5, 2011</td>
<td>College of Staten Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>May 11, 2011</td>
<td>LaGuardia Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRONX</td>
<td>May 12, 2011</td>
<td>Bronx Community College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H
Senior Colleges Faculty Representation by Race, Ethnicity and Gender 2001 – 2009

CUNY Chart 9

Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Senior Colleges, Race/Ethnicity: Asian

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Senior Colleges, Race/Ethnicity: Black/African-American

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Senior Colleges, Race/Ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino(a) (Including Puerto Rican)

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year

2001  2002  2003  2004  2005  2006  2007  2008  2009
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Senior Colleges, Race/Ethnicity: Italian American

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Senior Colleges, Race/Ethnicity: White/Caucasian

Year

Number of Full-time Faculty

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Senior Colleges, Gender: Men

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Senior Colleges, Gender: Women

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
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Community Colleges Faculty Representation Race, Ethnicity and Gender 2001 – 2009
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Community Colleges, Race/Ethnicity: Black/African-American

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009

College: Community Colleges, Race/Ethnicity: Hispanic/Latino(a) (including Puerto Rican)
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009

College: Community Colleges, Race/Ethnicity: Puerto Rican
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009

College: Community Colleges, Race/Ethnicity: Italian American

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Community Colleges, Race/Ethnicity: White/Caucasian

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
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Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Community Colleges, Gender: Men

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
CUNY Chart 24

Full-time Faculty 2001-2009
College: Community Colleges, Gender: Women

Number of Full-time Faculty

Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
Appendix J
Department Chairs by Campus

Baruch College: Race/Ethnicity
(Department Chairs)

Borough of Manhattan Community College:
Race/Ethnicity (Department Chairs)
Bronx Community College: Race/Ethnicity
(Department Chairs)

White/Caucasian 56%
Black/African American 19%
Hispanic/Latino(a) 19%
Puerto Rican 0%
Italian American 6%
Asian 0%

Brooklyn College: Race/Ethnicity
(Department Chairs)

White/Caucasian 82%
Asian 6%
Black/African American 6%
Hispanic/Latino(a) 0%
Puerto Rican 3%
Italian American 3%
The City College of New York: Race/Ethnicity
(Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 75%
- Asian: 6%
- Black/African American: 13%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 0%
- Puerto Rican: 3%
- Italian American: 3%

College of Staten Island: Race/Ethnicity
(Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 67%
- Unknown: 11%
- Asian: 11%
- Black/African American: 5%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 6%
- Italian American: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
Graduate School and University Center: Race/Ethnicity (Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 86%
- Asian: 8%
- Black/African American: 0%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 2%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Italian American: 4%

Eugenio Maria de Hostos Community College: Race/Ethnicity (Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 33%
- Puerto Rican: 34%
- Black/African American: 11%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 22%
- Italian American: 0%
- Asian: 0%
CUNY Diversity Study

Hunter College: Race/Ethnicity
(Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 64%
- Black/African American: 13%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 3%
- Puerto Rican: 7%
- Italian American: 3%
- Asian: 10%

John Jay College of Criminal Justice:
Race/Ethnicity (Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 67%
- Black/African American: 25%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 8%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Italian American: 0%
- Asian: 0%
Kingsborough Community College:  
Race/Ethnicity  (Department Chairs)

White/Caucasian: 80%
Asian: 0%
Black/African American: 0%
Hispanic/Latino(a): 7%
Puerto Rican: 0%
Italian American: 13%

Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College:  
Race/Ethnicity  (Department Chairs)

White/Caucasian: 55%
Asian: 18%
Black/African American: 9%
Hispanic/Latino(a): 0%
Puerto Rican: 9%
Italian American: 9%
Lehman College: Race/Ethnicity
(Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 67%
- Asian: 4%
- Black/African American: 7%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 4%
- Puerto Rican: 7%
- Italian American: 11%

Medgar Evers College: Race/Ethnicity
(Department Chairs)

- Black/African American: 76%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 6%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Italian American: 0%
- White/Caucasian: 12%
- Asian: 6%
New York City College of Technology: Race/Ethnicity (Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 52%
- Black/African American: 14%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 10%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Italian American: 21%
- Native American: 3%
- Asian: 0%

Queens College: Race/Ethnicity (Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 78%
- Black/African American: 6%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 3%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Italian American: 6%
- Asian: 7%
Queensborough Community College: Race/Ethnicity (Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 88%
- Asian: 6%
- Black/African American: 0%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 6%
- Italian American: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%

York College: Race/Ethnicity (Department Chairs)

- White/Caucasian: 53%
- Asian: 0%
- Black/African American: 18%
- Hispanic/Latino(a): 0%
- Italian American: 29%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
University Wide: Gender
(Department Chairs)

- Male: 60%
- Female: 40%

Baruch College: Gender
(Department Chairs)

- Male: 70%
- Female: 30%
Borough of Manhattan Community College: Gender (Department Chairs)

- Male: 37%
- Female: 63%

Bronx Community College: Gender (Department Chairs)

- Male: 44%
- Female: 56%
Brooklyn College: Gender
(Department Chairs)

- Female 38%
- Male 62%

The City College of New York: Gender
(Department Chairs)

- Female 31%
- Male 69%
College of Staten Island: Gender (Department Chairs)

- Male: 72%
- Female: 28%

Graduate School and University Center: Gender (Department Chairs)

- Male: 67%
- Female: 33%
Eugenio Maria de Hostos Community College: Gender (Department Chairs)

- Male: 56%
- Female: 44%

Hunter College: Gender (Department Chairs)

- Male: 53%
- Female: 47%
John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Gender
(Department Chairs)

Male 62%
Female 38%

Kingsborough Community College: Gender
(Department Chairs)

Male 60%
Female 40%
Queens College: Gender
(Department Chairs)

- Male: 78%
- Female: 22%

Queensborough Community College: Gender
(Department Chairs)

- Male: 76%
- Female: 24%
York College: Gender
(Department Chairs)

Female 53%
Male 47%
Appendix K
Faculty Diversity Climate Survey Findings

Overall faculty reported positively in regards to their satisfaction with their experience at CUNY, however, there were some differences in responses based on title, type of institution and years of service:

Title

Question 1B: If I had the opportunity to choose again, I would choose to work at CUNY.
- Lecturers more strongly agreed than assistant and full professors.

Question 1C: I am satisfied with the way my career at CUNY has progressed.
- Full professors agreed more strongly than associate professors.

Question 1D: I would describe my department as a good place to work.
- Lecturers more strongly agreed than assistant and associate professors.

Question 1E: I would describe my college as a good place to work.
- Lecturers more strongly agreed than assistant, associate and full professors.

Type of Institution

Question 1A: I am satisfied with my experience as a faculty member at CUNY.
- Graduate Center/Honors College/Professional College faculty more strongly agreed than senior college faculty.

Question 1B: If I had the opportunity to choose again, I would choose to work at CUNY.
- Graduate Center/Honors College/Professional Schools faculty, more strongly agreed than senior college faculty.

Question 1C: I am satisfied with the way my career at CUNY has progressed.
- Graduate Center/Honors College/Professional College faculty more strongly agreed than community college faculty.

Question 1E: I would describe my college as a good place to work.
- Graduate Center/Honors College/Professional School and community college faculty more strongly agreed than senior college faculty.

Years of Service

Question 1A: I am satisfied with my experience as a faculty member at CUNY.
• Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 0 to 10 years, 11 to 20 years or 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 1C: I am satisfied with the way my career at CUNY has progressed.
• Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 11 to 20 years of service or 21 to 30 years of service.

Inclusion and Belonging
The inclusion and belonging section contains statements including: whether one’s department is welcoming and whether faculty avoid disclosing aspects of their identity because of age, ethnicity, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, and sexual orientation. Faculty also responded to statements about the impact of faculty diversity on students, their department and academic standards. And finally, participants provided responses to statements about their feeling of a sense of inclusion and belonging to their department and college.

Overall faculty reported positively in regards to inclusion and belonging, however, there were some differences in responses based on race/ethnicity, title, type of institution and years of service:

Race/Ethnicity

Question 5H: Due to fear of negative consequences, I have avoided disclosing my sexual orientation.
• Whites/Caucasians more strongly disagreed than URMs

Question 2B: My department is welcoming to faculty regardless of disability.
• Asians more strongly agreed than Italian Americans

Question 6A: Faculty diversity results in better educational experience for students.
• URMs more strongly agreed than Whites/Caucasians.

Question 6B: Faculty diversity brings different perspectives into the department.
• Hispanics/Latinos(as) more strongly agreed than Whites/Caucasians
• African-Americans/Blacks agreed more strongly than Whites/Caucasians

Question 6C: It is difficult to have racial diversity among faculty and maintain high academic standards.
• URMs more strongly disagreed than Whites/Caucasians.
Title

Question 6A: Faculty diversity results in a better educational experience for students.
  • Lecturers, assistant and associate professors more strongly agreed than full professors.

Question 6B: Faculty diversity brings different perspectives into the department.
  • Lecturers, assistant and associate professors more strongly agreed than full professors.

Question 6C: It is difficult to have racial diversity among the faculty and maintain high academic standards.
  • Associate professors more strongly disagreed than full professors.

Type of Institution

Question 5G: Due to the fear of negative consequences, I have avoided disclosing to colleagues my religion.
  • Senior college faculty more strongly disagreed than community college faculty.

Years of Service

Question 2E: My department is welcoming to faculty regardless of national origin.
  • Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 3B: I feel a sense of inclusion and belonging in my college.
  • Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 0 to 10 years, 11 to 20 years and 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 4B: I have felt unwelcomed in my department because of my ethnicity.
  • Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly disagreed than faculty with 11 to 20 years of service.

Question 4F: I have felt unwelcomed in my department because of my race.
  • Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly disagreed than faculty who have 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 4H: I have felt unwelcomed in my department because of my sexual orientation.
  • Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly disagreed than faculty who have 0 to 10 years and 21 to 30 of service.
Question 5C: Due to fear of negative consequences, I have avoided disclosing to my colleagues my disability.
- Faculty who 30+ years of service more strongly disagreed than faculty who have 0 to 10 years and 11 to 20 years of service.

Question 5H: Due to fear of negative consequences, I have avoided disclosing to my colleagues my sexual orientation.
- Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly disagreed than faculty who have 0 to 10 years of service.

Question 6A: Faculty diversity results in better educational experience for students.
- Faculty who have 11 to 20 years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 30+ years of service.

Question 6B: Faculty diversity brings different perspectives into the department.
- Faculty who have 0 to 10 years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 11 to 20 years and 30+ years of service.

**Collegial Interaction**

Overall, faculty reported positive collegial interactions. However, there were some differences in responses based on race/ethnicity, title and years of service:

**Race/Ethnicity**

Question 7E: My area of research is valued by colleagues in my department.
- Whites/Caucasians agreed more strongly than URM.

Question 7F: My area of research is valued by colleagues in my division or school.
- Whites/Caucasians agreed more strongly than URM.

Question 7G: My area of research is valued by colleagues in my college.
- Asians more strongly agreed than Whites/Caucasians.

Question 7H: My department chair is approachable to discuss service issues or concerns.
- Whites/Caucasians agreed more strongly than Italian Americans.
- Asians more strongly agreed than Italian Americans.

Question 7I: My department chair is approachable to discuss teaching issues or concerns.
- Asians more strongly agreed than Italian Americans.

Question 7J: My department chair is approachable to discuss service issues or concerns.
• Asians more strongly agreed than Italian Americans.

**Title**

Question 7C: For the most part, I am treated with respect by my dean.
• Assistant professors more strongly agreed than associate professors.

**Years of Service at CUNY**

Question 7A: For the most part, I am treated with respect by my colleagues.
• Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 7D: For the most part, I am treated with respect by my departmental staff.
• Faculty who have CUNY 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 0 to 10 years of service.

Question 7F: My area of research is valued by colleagues in my division or school.
• Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 7G: My area of research is valued by colleagues in my college.
• Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 7K: I feel like my input is valued at department meetings.
• Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 0 to 10 years of service.

**Fairness/Consistency**

Overall, faculty reported positive regards to inclusion and belonging. However, there were some differences in race/ethnicity, title, type of institution and years of service:

**Race/Ethnicity**

Question 8G: I do a significant amount of committee service.
• African-Americans/Blacks agreed more strongly than Whites/Caucasians.

Question 8H: The committee service I do is formally recognized in the tenure and promotion process.
• Whites/Caucasians agreed more strongly than African-Americans/Blacks.
• Hispanics/Latinos(as) more strongly agreed than African-Americans/Blacks.

Question 8I: Minority faculty face a greater service load than do other faculty.
  • Asians more strongly disagreed than Hispanic/Latinos(as).

Title

Question 8D: The student mentoring I do is recognized in the tenure and promotion process.
  • Associate professors more strongly disagreed than lecturers.

Question 8F: The student advisement I do is recognized in the tenure and promotion process.
  • Associate professors more strongly disagreed than full professors.

Question 8G: I do a significant amount of committee service.
  • Assistant and associate professors more strongly agreed than lecturers.
  • Associate professors more strongly agreed than instructors.

Question 8J: Female faculty face a greater service load than do male faculty.
  • Lecturers and full professors more strongly disagreed than associate professors.

Question 8K: I have to/had to meet a higher standard for promotion than do/did other colleagues in my department.
  • Lecturers more strongly disagreed than assistant and associate professors.

Question 8K: I have to/had to meet a higher standard for tenure than do/did other colleagues in my department.
  • Assistant professors more strongly agreed than lecturers.

Question 8M: Female faculty who have children are considered by their department members to be less committed to their careers than women who do not have children.
  • Full professors more strongly disagreed than assistant professors.

Question 8N: Male faculty who have children are considered by their department members to be less committed to their careers than women who do not have children.
  • Full professors more strongly disagreed than assistant professors.
**Type of Institution**

Question 8H: The committee service I do is recognized in the tenure and promotion process.
- Community college faculty more strongly agreed than senior college faculty.

Question 8I: Minority faculty face a greater service load than do other faculty.
- Community college faculty more strongly disagreed than senior college faculty.

**Years of Service**

Question 8B: Performance expectations for faculty are communicated clearly by my department chair.
- Faculty who 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 11 to 20 years of service.

Question 8D: The student mentoring I do is recognized in the tenure and promotion process.
- Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 8F: The student advisement I do is recognized in the tenure and promotion process.
- Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 11 to 20 years of service.

Question 8H: The committee service I do is formally recognized in the tenure and promotion process.
- Faculty who have 0 to 10 years of service more strongly agreed than faculty who have 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 8I: Minority faculty face a greater service load than do other faculty.
- Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly disagreed than faculty who have 0 to 10 years and 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 8J: Female faculty face a greater service load than do male faculty.
- Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly disagreed than faculty who have 0 to 10 years, 11 to 20 years and 21 to 30 years of service.

Question 8K: I have to/had to meet a higher standard for promotion than do/did other colleagues in my department.
- Faculty who have 30+ years of service more strongly disagreed than faculty who have 0 to 10 years of service.
Appendix L
Academic Leadership by Campus

Baruch College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 64%
- Black/African American: 18%
- Hispanic: 9%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Asian: 9%
- Italian American: 0%

Borough of Manhattan Community College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- Black/African American: 67%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Asian: 33%
- Italian American: 0%
- White/Caucasian: 0%
Bronx Community College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 75%
- Black/African American: 0%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 25%
- Italian American: 0%
- Asian: 0%

Brooklyn College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 58%
- Italian American: 25%
- Asian: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Black/African American: 17%
The City College of New York: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 58%
- Black/African American: 12%
- Hispanic: 12%
- Puerto Rican: 12%
- Asian: 0%
- Italian American: 6%

College of Staten Island: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 66%
- Black/African American: 0%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Asian: 17%
- Italian American: 17%
CUNY School of Law: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 50%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Asian: 0%
- Italian American: 0%

Graduate School and University Center: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 100%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Asian: 0%
- Italian American: 0%
Eugenio Maria de Hostos Community College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 50%
- Black/African American: 0%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 50%
- Asian: 0%
- Italian American: 0%

Hunter College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 77%
- Black/African American: 15%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Italian American: 8%
- Asian: 0%
John Jay College of Criminal Justice:
Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- Italian American: 19%
- Asian: 6%
- Puerto Rican: 6%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Black/African American: 19%
- White/Caucasian: 50%

Kingsborough Community College:
Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- Italian American: 20%
- Asian: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 20%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Black/African American: 0%
- White/Caucasian: 60%
Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College:
Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 40%
- Black/African American: 40%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Asian: 0%
- Italian American: 20%

Lehman College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 86%
- Black/African American: 0%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Asian: 14%
- Italian American: 0%
Medgar Evers College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- Black/African American: 80%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Asian: 0%
- Italian American: 0%
- White/Caucasian: 0%

New York City College of Technology: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 75%
- Black/African American: 25%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Asian: 0%
- Italian American: 0%
Queens College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 78%
- Black/African American: 11%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Asian: 11%
- Italian American: 0%

Queensborough Community College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- Italian American: 50%
- White/Caucasian: 25%
- Black/African American: 0%
- Hispanic: 25%
- Asian: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
York College: Race/Ethnicity in Academic Leadership

- White/Caucasian: 60%
- Black/African American: 40%
- Hispanic: 0%
- Puerto Rican: 0%
- Italian American: 0%
- Asian: 0%
- Italian American: 0%

University Wide: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Female: 53%
- Male: 47%
Baruch College: Gender in Academic Leadership

Male 70%
Female 30%

Borough of Manhattan Community College: Gender in Academic Leadership

Male 67%
Female 33%
Bronx Community College: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Male: 75%
- Female: 25%

Brooklyn College: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Male: 33%
- Female: 67%
The City College of New York: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Female: 47%
- Male: 53%

College of Staten Island: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Female: 50%
- Male: 50%
CUNY School of Law: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Female: 100%
- Male: 0%

Graduate School and University Center: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Female: 67%
- Male: 33%
Eugenio Maria de Hostos Community College: Gender in Academic Leadership

Female 100%
Male 0%

Hunter College: Gender in Academic Leadership

Female 69%
Male 31%
John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Gender in Academic Leadership

Female 56%
Male 44%

Kingsborough Community College: Gender in Academic Leadership

Female 40%
Male 60%
Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Male: 40%
- Female: 60%

Lehman College: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Male: 43%
- Female: 57%
Medgar Evers College: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Male: 80%
- Female: 20%

New York City College of Technology: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Female: 100%
- Male: 0%
Queens College: Gender in Academic Leadership

Female: 44%
Male: 56%

Queensborough Community College: Gender in Academic Leadership

Female: 50%
Male: 50%
York College: Gender in Academic Leadership

- Male: 80%
- Female: 20%
Appendix IV: Ad Hoc Committee on Strengthening Faculty Diversity
Diversity Action Plan Team
Ad Hoc Committee on Strengthening Faculty Diversity*

Co-Chairs
Honorable Valerie Lancaster Beal
Board of Trustees

President Marcia Keizs
York College

Members*
Honorable Philip Berry
Vice Chair, Board of Trustees

Honorable Wellington Chen
Board of Trustees

Honorable Rita DiMartino
Board of Trustees

Senior Vice Chancellor Jay Hershenson
University Relations and Secretary of the Board of Trustees

President Lisa S. Coico
The City College of New York

Provost James Stellar
Queens College

Professor Calvin Holder
Faculty Senate Rep.
Department of History, College of Staten Island

Mr. Cory Provost
Student

*Vice Chancellor Gloriana Waters (Office of Human Resources Management) and University Dean Jennifer Rubain (Office of Recruitment and Diversity) assisted both committees.
Appendix V:
CUNY Diversity
Vision Statement
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Diversity Vision Statement

The City University of New York has long been recognized as one of the most diverse university systems in the nation. The University aims to enhance its national standing by continuing to build a diverse community that enriches its academic environment.

The University’s unwavering commitment to serving students, its insistence on academic rigor, and its support of world-class faculty guide its work to foster and promote an ever more diverse community of students, faculty, and staff. This pluralistic community is fundamental to the exchange of ideas and knowledge, scholarly discourse, and the engagement of the University’s constituencies.

The University respects individuals while acknowledging the differences among them. These differences include, but are not limited to, race, national origin, ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, and socioeconomic status. However, to create a vibrant academic, intellectual, and cultural environment for all, the University must move beyond representation to genuine participation. Thus, the University seeks to develop a community that is inclusive of all individuals and groups. Given CUNY’s long history of proactive support for diversity and inclusion, it is uniquely positioned to build upon that strong foundation and serve as a national leader and model, exemplifying the benefits that accrue when diversity and inclusion are integral components of an institution’s educational philosophy and core mission.
Appendix VI: Energizing Search Committees
As discussed in several places in the Cambridge Hill Partners’ Diversity Study report, the faculty search committee is the core component in hiring a more diverse faculty. Faculty search committees operate through the authority of the discipline and with the traditional academic freedom to select the best candidate in that discipline. Those factors may make it challenging for other broad institutional goals, such as encouraging diversity, to enter the process.

The institutional and departmental context for the faculty search committee matters a great deal. The committee and its chair must be advocates for diversity. Increasing diversity requires some different elements from the traditional search process and more effort on the part of the department and search committee. Energizing the faculty search committee begins well before the search with discussions of the issues, training, and orientation on effective practices in faculty searches and diversity, and the development of a shared understanding of the importance of faculty diversity to the broader college and university communities.

Within this context, traditional charges to the faculty search committee can then be made without creating what can otherwise be seen as another legalistic hurdle that must be surmounted in order for the committee to do its work.

Energized faculty search committees depend upon a number of factors:

- **Clear charge.** Building on the commitment of the institution, a clear, consistent charge should include discussion of specific issues, including the nature of permitted pool-building activities, how the chair or members of the search committee may help increase the diversity of the applicant pool by networking with colleagues, and other activities of concern to the committee and its members.

- **Correct composition.** The chair must select the search committee carefully. High standards must combine with strong commitment. To borrow a phrase from business literature, one needs “the right people on the bus.” Departments that routinely use their elected “appointments” committees as the search committee should know that it is permissible to ask colleagues to join in the screening and interview process.

- **Pool building by outreach, not just advertisement.** The search committee must go beyond placing advertisements and waiting for applicants, even if many candidates apply. The chair or senior member(s) should actively reach out to hidden pools by calling colleagues in the field who train graduate students/postdoctoral fellows, using available lists to reach out to some potential candidates to ask them to apply, and taking other proactive steps to build the pool.

- **Introduction to other diverse faculty and students during interview visit.** When candidates from diverse backgrounds visit the institution, it is important to introduce them to students and faculty from
similar backgrounds and professional interests. It builds community, improves candidates’ sense of the place, and allows for conversations that candidates may not have with anyone on the search committee. These introductions do not replace any element of the campus visit that every other candidate receives but help to show diverse candidates the community that exists on campus.

- **Search funding.** If a search feels poor, it tends to act poor. Severe limitations on the ability to travel to conferences, fly in candidates, etc. can undermine the search and must be addressed. It is the administration’s job to adequately fund the search process.

- **Salary and benefits.** A basic law of economic supply and demand is that a person who is in demand is more expensive. It may be necessary to pay a slightly higher salary or offer some other benefit (e.g., travel) to attract sought-after candidates. This is a particular challenge for a transparent public university. However, the practice is no different than that currently employed in hard-to-fill disciplines.

- **Mentoring after hiring.** Too many new faculty members are left without intellectual and moral support after they are hired. Nothing so quickly undermines an institutional goal to diversify the faculty than the departure of recently hired faculty members who were not energized by the institution.

The energized search committee operates within the context of the institution. Three key institutional factors are:

1. **Diverse faculty population.** The first thing diverse faculty candidates look at—even before they apply for a position—is whether they are the only diverse faculty member in the unit. If there are no other faculty members like themselves in the unit, the institution may want to consider the possibility of hiring two talented and diverse candidates at the same time. This offers a support system and prevents the feeling of isolation that impacts retention.

2. **Diverse student population.** If the student body is not diverse, it may be harder to convince faculty candidates from under-represented groups to apply to the campus or accept an offer.

3. **Strong support for relevant research centers.** New scholars often examine the leadership of campus centers that address issues of inclusion. Are they scholars? What kind of space and staff support do these programs or centers have? How vigorous is their presence on campus?

Some other factors that relate to searches are:

- **The use of substitute lines.** Substitute lines often result in smaller applicant pools, fewer efforts to advertise and market the position, and possibly fewer exceptional candidates compared with a national search. The use of substitute lines should be limited to emergency situations. When substitutes are in the pool of a nationally advertised search, there may be a tendency to favor the person already doing the job.

- **Isolation.** This factor deserves repeating. If there is no diverse representation in a department, consider making two talented and diverse hires at once to create that community or a joint appointment with a more diverse department. Isolation is a significant impediment to a faculty member’s feeling
included, and concrete steps must be taken to ensure faculty have opportunities to make linkages that will encourage retention.

• **Strong partnership between the diversity office and the academic leadership.** Without this partnership, department search committees may treat the diversity requirement as a legalistic obligation instead of a real opportunity to hire the best candidate. The provost, dean, and department chair must be involved, knowledgeable, and committed to an inclusive search. The president sets the goals/tone and must do so clearly, but the entire academic leadership team must accept accountability and work closely with the campus diversity officer.

• **Retention of a diverse faculty.** The loss of a faculty member not only requires a new search but also contributes to the impression that the institution does not genuinely care about diversity, which makes recruitment more difficult.

• **Target-of-opportunity hires to promote diversity.** Sometimes a department may identify an outstanding candidate but does not have an open faculty line. If the department, provost, and president agree that the candidate should be hired, the campus diversity officer may request a search waiver from the university in order to hire the candidate without a formal search. Although these waivers are rarely given, colleges should consider them when a target-of-opportunity hire presents itself. A successful waiver can set a positive example to faculty search committees. However, the process should be used sparingly and only for truly exceptional hires. Having a few target-of-opportunity hires can change the campus climate, encourage departments to propose searches in areas where diverse candidates exist in higher numbers, and inspire faculty search committees to try harder to achieve diversity through their own searches.