Year-End Report: Senate Diversity Committee 2022-2023 Submitted by Committee Chair: Prof. Tanya Menon

Committee Members

MEMBER	SOURCE	TERM EXPIRES
Donna Ford	Faculty Council	2023
Tanya Menon	Presidential	2023
Mohamed Yousif	Faculty Council	2024
Rachel Childers	Faculty Council	2024
Niru Nahar	Faculty Council	2024
Sophia Jeong	Faculty Council	2025
Lucille Toth	Faculty Council	2025
Lisa Florman	Presidential	2024
Julius McIntyre	USG	2023
Sagarika Taneja	CGS	2023
Steven Jiang	IPC	2023

MEMBER	SOURCE	TERM EXPIRES
Ramsey Piazza	Staff (USAC)	2024
Derek West	Staff (USAC)	2023
	Staff (Presidential)	2022
Wendy Smooth	Provost / Designee (Non-Voting)	
Linette Hillis	AVP OHR / Designee (Non-Voting)	
Ajit Chaudhari	Prior Years Chair (Non-Voting)	

While Sara Childers was not an official member, she participated in many of our meetings and offered much advice. Provost Wendy Smooth attended all meetings and advised us in numerous ways. Lucille Toth resigned due to other administrative responsibilities, and several members turned out to be on leave of absences or had left the university (Linette Hillis, Derek West, Mohamed Yousif)

Introduction

The Ohio State University Senate Diversity Committee operates under the following charge: The committee shall study issues that relate to the implementation of the university's nondiscriminatory policy. It shall recommend policies that foster an environment of civility, tolerance, and mutual respect. It shall perform the following functions with appropriate administrative support from the office of academic affairs and the office of human resources.

1. Study and evaluate issues affecting diversity from an overall university perspective.

2. Be informed on external requirements on the university affecting diversity.

3. Advise the president, the executive vice president and provost, the associate vice president for human resources, and the vice president for student life about the institutional climate, policies, and priorities for ensuring justice, fairness, and equitable treatment to all members of the university.

4. Educate and inform the university community on issues of diversity, including the letter and spirit of all Ohio and federal rules regarding members of protected classes. a. Oversee administration of university affirmative action grants and awards. b. Report annually to the university senate.

The committee held monthly virtual meetings beginning August 16, 2022 to May, 1 2023 (with the exception of April). The committee chair also held meetings with undergraduate student leader Kelsey Lowman prior to the start of the term, and attended some of the student meetings during the year.

The committee meetings included a dialogue with guests and discussion within the committee to understand existing efforts, identify challenges and potential remedies. The committee thanks all invited guests for making time to meet with the committee and share their expertise with the committee. The guests included:

1. Members of CSA committee on minimum student wages.
2. Arvcuken (Arthur) Noquisi, indigenous student who shared concerns from Native American community so we could build upon our land acknowledgement.
3. Jewish students focused on IHRA definition anti-semitism.
4. Dr. Tim San Pedro, Professor of Critical Studies in Race, Justice, and Equity. Helped us think about encouraging faculty grace/responsiveness to students facing mental and other personal challenges.
5. Patrick Louchourn, Provost, spoke to us about equitable tenure processes.
6. Mary Stromberger, Provost, spoke to us about diversifying PHD application pools.
7. Kevin Leonardi, OSU Legal. Helped us navigate media concerns surrounding diversity issues.
8. Ben Johnson, Assistant Vice President, Media & Public Relations. Helped us navigate media concerns surrounding diversity issues.
9. Dr. Franco Barchesi, Professor of African American Studies. Helped us think about labor acknowledgement.
10. Dr. Andre Brown, Assistant Dean for Diversity, Equity & Inclusion, College of Arts and Sciences. Helped us think about labor acknowledgement.
11. Dr. Robin Judd, Professor of Jewish history. Helped us think about Anti Semitism definitions, debates, and supporting the Jewish community on campus.

One of our other duties is to select and notify recipients of the University's Distinguished Diversity Enhancement Awards. The award is given each year to select individuals or groups who have made a substantial contribution toward enhancing diversity within the university. This year's selection committee members were: Sophia Jeong, Steven Jiang, Debbie Jones, Tanya Menon, and Sagarika Taneja. Michele Bondurant of the Office of Human Resources coordinated the review of applications and select recipients. We received many worthy applications and chose severals exceptional candidates. We participated in surprise award announcements that were held virtually.

The committee had a busy year and I will focus on a) Issues we raised that were advanced by Senior Leadership relatively rapidly; b) Several focus areas where we have provided initial recommendations to senior leadership, and c) Challenges that are yet to be addressed.

I. Issues that advanced rapidly with support of senior leadership

1. Rachel Childers raised issues of minimum student wage. We heard from student organizers in this area, and we offered them our committee's support. We also learned that the university had taken action to address this issue.
2. Rachel Childers raised issues of childcare support during conference travel. She presented these concerns to Dr. Patrick Louchouarn who informed us that he supported and would advance the concern.

II. Recommendations to university/provosts. We considered three critical issues: (1) Acknowledgements (Land, Labor) (2) Promotion/tenure equity, and (3) Diversifying graduate student applications.

1. Acknowledgements

-Land Acknowledgement. Prior chair Ajit Chaudhari wrote and initiated the process of passing the land acknowledgement (see appendix 1). We were able to pass this acknowledgement this year, which involved meetings with CSA and relevant faculty.

-Labor acknowledgement. We decided that a parallel acknowledgement with respect to slave labor was also necessary. Committee member Julius McIntyre wrote this acknowledgement (see appendix 2). We heard from two experts in the area on this subject, Dr. Franco Barchesi and Dr. Andre Brown who advised us on the issue, especially in the current climate.

We have viewed these acknowledgements as simply a first step, and hope to go well beyond it. To advise us in this process, we have requested that we have representation from a member of OSU's Indigenous community on this committee.

A key point that emerged from these conversations was the major drop in Indigenous student admissions this past year. This was traced to the leave of an admissions officer with strong ties in the community. We discussed the implication that there was not a systematic process in place, but instead reliance on the relationships/efforts of certain motivated individuals and how to ensure that such ties continue even after a single individual's departure.

2. Promotion/tenure equity. Last year, we began a conversation on the challenges faced by women/minorities in tenure processes, and these key areas were summarized by Ajit here, https://padlet.com/ajitchaudhari/fnjjufel8g6h4pep. This year, Provost Dr. Patrick Louchouarn addressed the committee to share initiatives at the university level to improve these processes. We developed a series of recommendations (see appendix below) that we shared with our provosts. While we have many internal debates about these issues, we presented each of the recommendations to open this conversation. Two key points: 1) creating a more structured meeting process and 2) widening the criteria to appreciate diverse types of contribution.

3. PHD diversification. We observed the low numbers of underrepresented minorities in our PHD applicant pool. We heard from Provost Dr. Mary Stromberger on pipeline programs and other efforts. We prepared the recommendations in the appendix to encourage more diverse applications. We were particularly hopeful that existing undergraduate research forums could be leveraged to solicit diverse PHD applicants.

III. Challenges

1. One challenge this year was managing the concerns of Jewish Students on Anti-Semitism on campus. When we learned of the antisemitic stickers on campus, we immediately responded to student concerns and invited them to our meeting. These conversations were challenging for numerous reasons.

Following these interactions, we reviewed our processes. Some concerns we raised were:

1. Identifying OSU advisors for student groups to help them understand university committee processes.
2. We discussed procedures to allow committee members to privately discuss issues.
3. Given the sensitivity of these conversations (and others), we discussed appropriate communications approaches.
4. We reached out to members of the campus Jewish community to identify perspectives about IHRA and other definitions of anti-semitism and b) refocus on broader ways to support Jewish students re campus safety. One of our committee members attended an open debate on the pros/cons of the IHRA definition on campus. We have been engaging the advice of Dr. Robin Judd, a faculty expert on anti-semitism, who spoke to our committee in May.

2. An upcoming challenge will be navigating SB 83, the Ohio Higher Education Enhancement Act. Provost Wendy Smooth has discussed this Senate Bill with us, and how it affects the way we do our work.

Appendix 1. Land Acknowledgement Resolution

A Resolution to develop an official Land Acknowledgment for use at The Ohio State University

Synopsis: To advance greater inclusion and fulfill the university's anti-racism efforts, the Senate Diversity Committee and Senate Council on Student Affairs seek the development and adoption of an official land acknowledgment by The Ohio State University.

WHEREAS a land acknowledgement, typically a verbal statement made at the beginning of an event or meeting or a written statement, such as on websites or in email signatures, has become a standard practice for diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education; and

WHEREAS The Ohio State University's Vision is to be the model 21st-century, land grant, research, urban, community-engaged institution university; and

WHEREAS land acknowledgments create a more inclusive and honest environment for Indigenous and Native American members of The Ohio State University community and guests; and

WHEREAS acknowledging the ways that The Ohio State University benefited from and continues to benefit from the forced and systemic removal of Native American and Indigenous people provides a step toward reconciliation of the land grant mission of the university with its land grant history; and

WHEREAS the use of a land acknowledgment is a step from The Ohio State University toward supporting tribal sovereignty, remaining accountable, furthering advocacy and allyship, and creating ongoing relationships with Native American and Indigenous communities; and

WHEREAS a land acknowledgment can only be developed through active collaboration between The Ohio State University and Native American and Indigenous communities forcibly removed from lands across the United States to fund The Ohio State University; and

WHEREAS members of The Ohio State University community, from the Newark Earthworks Center, American Indian Studies faculty and staff, and Stepping Up & Stepping Out: The Land-Grant Truth and Reconciliation Project, have the expertise and ability to establish and build upon existing relationships with Native American and Indigenous communities forcibly removed from lands across the United States to fund The Ohio State University but are not currently tasked with collaborating with these Native American and Indigenous communities to develop a land acknowledgment as part of their official responsibilities; and

WHEREAS members of the Ohio State University community, notably Stepping Up & Stepping Out: The Land-Grant Truth and Reconciliation Project and the Newark Earthworks Center, have completed work, funded through The Ohio State University's Seed Fund for Racial Justice, Global Arts & Humanities Discovery Theme, and Linkage and Leverage Grant, that can serve as a foundation for a university-wide Land Acknowledgement; and

WHEREAS members of Native American and Indigenous communities cannot be expected to volunteer their time without compensation in service of the creation of a land acknowledgment for The Ohio State University;

NOW THEREFORE
BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate requests the President and the Board of Trustees create and financially support formation of a commission of experts from The Ohio State University and Native American and Indigenous communities to develop an official Land Acknowledgment for use by members of The Ohio State University community to affirm an inclusive and welcoming environment for Indigenous and Native American peoples, acting as a further step toward strengthening advocacy and allyship with Native American and Indigenous communities.

Appendix 2: Labor Acknowledgement (Draft)

A Resolution to develop an official Slave Labor Acknowledgment for use at The Ohio State University

Synopsis: To advance, respect, and honor the exploited indentured servitude used to provide the foundational frameworks of the university. While also promoting greater inclusion and fulfilling the university's anti-racism efforts, the University Senate Diversity Committee seeks to develop and adopt an official Slave Labor acknowledgment by The Ohio State University.

WHEREAS through the provisions of the Morrill Land-Grant Act, which was signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862; the nation's approach to higher education was revolutionized, bringing a college degree within reach of all high school graduates; and
WHEREAS Morrill Land-Grant Act tenets signaled much greener educational pastures for Ohio's African American populace who had already overcome *de jure* segregation; and

WHEREAS a land acknowledgment, typically a verbal statement made at the beginning of an event or meeting; or, a written statement, such as on websites or in email signatures; has become a standard practice for promoting and fostering diversity, equity, and inclusion within institutions of higher education; and

WHEREAS The Ohio State University's self-purported vision is to be the model 21st-century, land grant, research, urban, community-engaged institution university; and

WHEREAS a slave labor acknowledgment aims to intentionally focus squarely on Black Americans' historical realities of the abduction, bondage, and involuntary servitude of their descendants, including and how the tremors of slavery, Jim Crow, and ongoing white supremacy that have reverberated throughout the generations; and

WHEREAS a slave labor acknowledgment would cultivate an environment for African and African American members of The Ohio State University community and guests to promote honesty, transparency, and homage to that sacred and triumphant history; and

WHEREAS the combined African American student population on The Ohio State University campuses totals over 5,200 (7.7%) in composition; and

WHEREAS The Ohio State University current leadership may not have had direct involvement in the exploitation of thousands of indentured servants for the creation and sustainability of the university; and

WHEREAS however, this institution is still responsible for educating its community and itment to advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion measures by acknowledging the dark history of colonialism, slavery, and oppression that occurred throughout this campus's history; and

WHEREAS likewise, The Ohio State University's current leadership may not have a direct role in the historical displacement and compromisation exploitation of Black people in the Columbus community; and

WHEREAS despite such, the University again is still obligated to acknowledge the dark history of anti-Black violence that plagued its origins and sustenance; and

WHEREAS acknowledging the ways that The Ohio State University benefited from and continues to benefit from the forced and systemic oppression of African and African American people provides a step toward reconciliation of the land-grant mission of the university with its land-grant history; and

WHEREAS the use of a slave labor acknowledgment is a step for The Ohio State University toward supporting Black resiliency, upholding accountability, furthering advocacy and allyship, and creating ongoing relationships with African and African American students, faculty, staff, and communities; and

WHEREAS having experienced historically negative student-life experiences at OSU, many African-American students perceive university policies and practices as barriers and impediments to graduation; and

WHEREAS without denying important mitigating factors, the United States of today is strongly linked to the values and premises on which it was founded; that is, as a settler colony founded primarily on two basic pillars, upheld by the Judeo-Christian tradition: genocide of indigenous peoples; and slave labor in support of a capitalist infrastructure; and

WHEREAS members of African and African American communities cannot be expected to volunteer their time without some compensatory measure in service or recognition, by which the creation of a slave labor acknowledgment for The Ohio State University would offer that in perpetuity; and

WHEREAS The Ohio State University has capitalized, monopolized, and aggrandized from the involuntary servitude of exploited livelihoods of African and African Americans; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate requests the President and the Board of Trustees to create and financially support the formation of a commission of experts from The Ohio State University and African American scholars to develop an official Slave Labor Acknowledgment for use by members of The Ohio State University community to affirm an inclusive and welcoming environment for African and African American folk, acting as a further step toward strengthening advocacy and allyship with African and African American communities.

Appendix 3: Report on equitable faculty promotion & tenure

January 2023

During the 2021-2022 academic year, the Senate Diversity Committee (SDC) spent several meetings creating and reviewing a list of inequities experienced by faculty from minoritized groups at the university. The committee also heard from guests from Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis and the OSU College of Public Health on changes they have made that could potentially be applied university-wide at OSU. General categories of inequities and specific examples of inequities in these categories are listed below. Recommendations are listed.

Challenge	Recommendations
The tenure process is a social and political process. • Groupthink, social pressure, lack of psychological safety, fear of retaliation, and politicking. • If the committee only contains one member of a marginalized group, that person may not feel the psychological safety to speak up and be heard without retribution or retaliation. • People often come to these meetings unprepared and simply focus on whether they like the candidate. • The same data can be spun negatively or positively based on the likeability of the candidate.	Encourage open communication and fact-based communication, minimizing peer-pressure and politics • Prior to the meeting, all participants should complete and submit an anonymous structured evaluation forms (with quantitative/qualitative input) that considers the candidate's strengths and weaknesses on each criteria. • These can be shared during the meeting. • Pertinent facts that were not surfaced in the verbal discussion can be raised at the end.
Unstructured free-for-all where the loudest, most powerful voices dominate P&T meetings can under-structured and free-form, and in such situations, our biases enter to provide a structure.	Create a standardized protocol Just as standardized interview protocols (asking each interviewee the same questions in the same order) help debias impressionistic interviews, the university should provide departments with standardized protocols/scripts to organize these meetings so that the same issues are discussed in the same order in the same manner.
No standards, shifting yardsticks Research indicates that women/minorities are subject to a moveable bar whereby standards continually move around, creating subjectivity in evaluation processes.	Clear, salient criteria • The university should provide a template powerpoint where each standard in the promotion/tenure document can be projected onto the screen as it is discussed to ensure that the same standards are highly salient for each candidate. • These criteria should be read aloud prior to evaluating that dimension.
'Procedural violations' prevalent in women/minority cases • P&T processes for minoritized vs. Majority group candidates appear to have more "procedural violations". • The current university policy of "re-doing" the tenure meeting in the event of a procedural violation compounds biases, rather than rectifying them. Departmental members may know others' votes/arguments and the department head's votes, which creates known biases in terms of groupthink/status. Additionally, the 'losers' of the first vote could also be more motivated to speak up to convince/persuade/push arguments they felt were unheard to win this time.	End re-do meetings, take accountability for what happened, why, and effects of the violation on fair evaluation process • Measure the number of procedural violations occurring in P&T cases as a function of race, gender, sexual orientation, international vs. domestic, etc. • The current university policy of "re-doing" the tenure meeting in the event of a procedural violation should be eliminated. Instead, the violation should be explained, what caused it should be articulated, and the biases it could have potentially created should be identified by the department/ candidate. It should be addressed at the next level, not 'corrected' by a re-do by the level that created the biased process in the first place.
Biased inferences from ambiguous data: Collaboration Collaboration penalty: Women are given less credit for collaborative work. When Teamwork Doesn't Work for Women - The New York Times (nytimes.com). These biases can also affect people based on age, gender, race, and nationality.	Capture clear evidence of contribution Promotion committees should capture clear evidence of contribution on the papers before drawing inferences about leadership, contribution, and workload on the papers. In many fields, authors are now required to explicitly list contributions on each paper.
Biased inferences from ambiguous data: Reference letters • Letters are freeform—varying in length, criteria, and stringency. They often say more about the letter writer than the candidate.	Standardized evaluation questions, debias letters, careful inferences • Utilize a standard template from university/department to ensure that external letter writers answer the same questions using common standards. • Use bias checking software to identify potentially biased language in these letters. • Do not make inferences based on unclear information from these letters (e.g whether reviewers decline to write for the candidate, length of the letter).

Biased inferences from ambiguous data: Likability bias • Likeability bias dominates these discussions. If people like the candidate, they are subjected to a low bar, and if they are disliked their bar is insurmountable. • Worse, likability is being defined by a small group of senior people, so it is essentially the candidate's skill in politicking with their superiors that matters. • People like those who are similar, so this effect operates against minorities. • People dislike those who disagree with them, and these biases can be particularly strong against outspoken minorities.	Clear standards for collegiality, broadening beyond upward impression management • Eliminate ambiguous terms like collegiality from these discussions. If it cannot be captured in 'service,' it should be clearly defined in other ways. • Capture broader, more specific measures of collegiality including 360 type ratings of peers, junior faculty, and administrative staff, so that upward impression management isn't the only dimension at play.
Biased inferences from ambiguous data: Face time bias • "Being in the office" is regularly used as a performance indicator and signal of commitment. • It is non-performance-based, micro-managing, and disproportionately used to control/monitor certain people but to others. • It is also gender-biased given that child care responsibilities are not evenly distributed. • Mothers bear a greater burden, especially when their children are young and when the children have disabilities. These trends have been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic and an extreme shortage of child care services.	Focus on performance outcomes vs. face time • According to economist Claudia Goldin, industries with the most flexibility around work hours have smallest gender wage gaps. gender_equality.pdf (harvard.edu) • As flexibility (vs. facetime) is a proven gender-debiaser, practices in this regard should be part of department head/dean's scorecard.
Biased inferences from ambiguous data: All the others • The above is a drop in the bucket.	• Identify and flag other non-evidence based inferences that enter these evaluations. • Prior to reviews, participants should be given a list of common biases that negatively impact fair review with examples and it should be saliently displayed (e.g., National Institutes of Health standard training for all scientific reviewers).
Narrow, self-serving yardsticks for research • Having clear standards is debiasing. However, having narrow standards (often based on self-justifying yardsticks) is not. • APT documents often speak about impact broadly but faculty often translate it narrowly any way. • **Common measures of impact are subject to biases. People are doing identical work, getting less credit** -Citation penalty: Women are cited less often than men, and groups of color are less cited than their White counterparts. This trend has been identified across fields and does not appear to be driven by seniority or by the most highly cited papers. -Credit penalty: Women and people of color receive less credit and/or experience poorer perceptions and evaluations of the same work. -Attentional inequities: Women and people of color are invited less frequently to give invited presentations. • People are also doing different work, which is less appreciated: Due to biases in the publication process,	Broader measures of impact, recognizing the biases of particular measures • Given that there are many measures of impact and excellence, these should be captured in the evaluations. We should also recognize the biases of any particular measures we are using. • Explicit guidance from the Office of Academic Affairs that the emphasis in evaluations should be on impact and that specific metrics are only valuable as evidence of that impact. Commonly-used metrics are not the only ones that can be used as evidence, and they should not be used as evidence without explanation of how they demonstrate impact and without consideration of the biases they may implicate. • Measure the diversity of invited speakers in OSU's own departmental seminars on department chair score card. • In promotion & tenure deliberations and evaluations, emphasis should be on the impact of the scholarship on the field, on the consumers, and the community, broadening the range of acceptable journals.

minority-focused scholarship gets pushed to more specialized, less prestigious, less visible journals and venues. • Scholarship that serves communities outside of academic scholars is undervalued. This is concerning given that we are a land grant university and are encouraged to engage in communities.	
Narrow pools of evaluators • It is well known that diversity of all dimensions decreases with seniority in departmental faculty. Membership in the P&T committee is limited to the most senior faculty. These senior faculty may be less knowledgeable about specific areas of scholarship, teaching, and service such as disparities scholarship, online teaching, and mentoring under-served students, faculty, and staff. Individuals who are farther away in time from being an early-career faculty member or who work in a different sub-field may discount the challenges faced or over-value individuals who are following the same path that they took. • Majority group members are advantaged by being evaluated by fellow majority group members at each level, while Minority group members are being evaluated by majority (outgroup) members. • This also occurs in the selection of outside letters. • We activate ingroup/outgroup biases that affect who gets the benefit of the doubt (I.e. Ingroups vs. outgroups).	Diversifying the evaluator pool • Ensure diverse representation in outside letters so that minorities are not being evaluated by outgroups, while majority group members benefit by evaluations from ingroup members. • Expand criteria for external evaluators of scholarship beyond eminent tenured faculty in the broader field where appropriate. People outside of academia may be better positioned to evaluate the impact of scholarship. • Expand use of alternative metrics of impact beyond publication in academic journals or citations in academic journals to the forms of dissemination that have the greatest impact on relevant communities. • Carefully assess why disconnects might occur between external and internal evaluation.
Narrow measures of teaching impact Women and people of color are called upon to teach minority-serving topics such as disparities, equity, critical race theory, etc. If these topics are taught in required courses such as the General Education course, these instructors may face backlash from students through lower student evaluations of instruction or in other ways. Relatedly, women and minoritized faculty received lower SEIs just by virtue of not being males and White. A large volume of studies and reports attest to this injustice.	Broader measures of teaching impact • The university should provide explicit guidance that numeric SEI scores are not to be used in the assessment of teaching to compare one instructor to others and share evidence of biases in these measures. • Consider a broader range of methods to evaluate teaching beyond student ratings: Qualitative comments, creative/novel teaching methods, mentorship of students, and improvement over time.
Narrow measures of service Women and people of color provide increased service to support students or other community members from under-served groups, a.k.a. the "Diversity Tax". While this work is important and valuable to the university and unit in advancing the mission and shared values, there is no clear guidance on how and where to document this work in the dossiers or how it should be valued and evaluated.	Broader measures of service • Create explicit subsections in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service sections to discuss contributions to inclusive excellence with explicit guidance on the importance of describing both formal and informal work and its impact. • Consider creation of an Integrative Inclusive Excellence path to promotion that recognizes efforts towards inclusive excellence across all areas (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) similar to a Teaching Excellence, Scholarship Excellence, or Service Excellence path. Such a path would recognize that achieving inclusive excellence is a Shared Value with as much impact on the University and broader community as Teaching, Scholarship, or Service are individually.

	• Expectations do not match assigned duties. If a faculty member is assigned more teaching and/or more service, and has less time available for scholarship, they should be evaluated accordingly. In many units, the scholarship alone or in large part determines whether the faculty member receives a favorable evaluation. • Evaluation of each component of a faculty members work (teaching, scholarship, service) should be based on the effort they are assigned to devote to it.
Candidates are often assigned a point of contact in the department or advocate, but their role is often limited.	**Expand the departmental point of contact's role to include diversity considerations** • Advocate should be an expert in the same sub-field, • Advocate should expand their role to ensure diversity/equity best practices are followed. • Advocate should identify potential biases in the evaluation process when they are observed. • Advocate should help the department identify and invite a broad, diverse set of external reviewers. • Ensure that everyone present understands the responsibilities of advocate's role.
Prior bias/harassment creates a contaminated pool of evaluators • The traumas of racism, sexism, xenophobia, and exclusion in daily life outside of work have negative effects on faculty members' productivity, effectiveness, and relationships at work. • Cortina's work on selective incivility shows that people feel particularly entitled to exhibit disrespect to women and particularly minority women. (i.e., rudeness, not necessarily overtly race/gender based) • These dynamics mean that there is a high chance that the very people evaluating minorities may be those who have subjected them to overt bias or generalized incivility/disrespect. • People are afraid to report because of perceptions that the process is too slow, no real action will be taken, and the perpetrators will be able to retaliate with impunity. Retaliation includes biasing others in the TIU against an individual, not just overt retaliation by the harasser.	Decontaminating the pool • Harassment should be addressed by 3rd party teams, not OSU HR processes due to conflicts of interest. • Participation in promotion & tenure deliberations should be considered a privilege, not a right. Individuals who have a history of harassing or of creating a hostile environment should lose that privilege. • Candidates should have a right to remove specific individuals from the pool if prior harassment/complaints might impact the evaluation. • If entire group is contaminated due to prior harassment/networked based processes, create mechanisms for 3rd-party accountability rather than using internal individuals who likely are conflicted by existing relationships.
Bias training • Bias training is a common catch-all solution for all diversity problems. • These trainings are rarely measured for effectiveness • Dobbin & Kalev found that they simply threaten white males and provide no measurable benefit to minorities. • Many harassers self-identify as highly moral and fair, and strongly endorse diversity beliefs in these trainings and in the work place.	Proven solutions with measurable gains • The solutions in this document have gone far deeper than training to the source of biased behavior. • Any trainings we do should be measured for impact: are there measurable benefits in reducing bias in these processes? • We should not be wasting time/money on solutions that do not work: each of the solutions above are based on research and best practices. • They should also be measured for impact in OSU context.

• Even if they don't, changing people's beliefs is irrelevant/impossible; the more appropriate goal is to change behavior. • Trainings can be one shot at the beginning of the year and are not salient vs. debiasing techniques baked into the process.	

Appendix IV. Increasing the pool of minority candidates to our PHD programs.

This chart focuses on getting underrepresented OSU undergrads to apply (which is lower hanging fruit than expanding the pipeline more generally—a conversation for another day!). We also raised issues like focused mentoring to ensure people are able to complete these programs with support (also a separate conversation).

Barrier	Solution
Faculty/administrator knowledge: -Do faculty/administrators understand the true barriers that are preventing our diverse students from submitting applications to our programs?	• Surveys to understand challenges by demography • What do students know/assume about grad school/this career path? What are their reservations about the path? • Which OSU students decide to go to grad school, but to another university? Why do they choose to leave OSU?
Student knowledge: -Do minority students have knowledge of graduate school admissions process, funding, and pathways? -Tuition is free, they will receive a stipend -Do they know how to apply, what's required, and what makes for a strong candidacy?	Ensuring information is provided at multiple channels where students learn • Academic advisors • Pairing undergrads with graduate/faculty mentors • University workshops are ok, but they speak to those who are already have interest. Advisors can message to those who might not have considered it. • In upper-level courses in the area, can information about how to pursue grad programs at OSU be embedded into the canvas course site?
Do minority students know about the pipeline programs? (Mary's document)	• Email that list to students; have academic advisors spend time going over the opportunities. • Get the list to student affinity groups. • Place the list on a high traffic website that students go to. • Coordination between these programs to maximize awareness/publicity.
Clear communication on application fee waiver	• It is likely already free (fee waivers) • Communicate this information better. • E.g. in junior year, qualified OSU students are emailed that they have an admissions fee waiver for OSU's grad programs. It's automatically active in their profiles so they don't have to fill out any paperwork to ensure they qualify for the waiver.
Clear communication on funding	• Clear, unequivocal guarantee of funding in admissions process.
Behavioral channels: Connecting intention to action in pipeline programs, enrichment fellowships	• During the pipeline program, have students begin the application process in a final meeting, if they are interested

Behavioral channels: Connecting intention to action in directing smart students to PHD program via early admissions.	• By junior year, students can apply to be considered for guaranteed admission to the PHD programs. (This is done in business schools, admission is given when they are seniors). This is trickier in PHD programs where funding is limited. But perhaps set aside one admission for this type of process per year). • Wendy notes it's done in college sports as well—so why not grad school?
Behavioral channels: Connecting intention to action in OSU undergrad forums (e.g. Denman, Hayes)	• Get fact sheet about grad school admissions (in their packets), how to's, links. • When they sign up for the forum participation, they can click through a few informational slides on applying to OSU graduate programs that can take them to the application pages
Faculty proactivity about getting funding	• Call your program officer-ask for this supplemental funding. Mechanism to diversify your lab