Position Title and Number:	Associate/Full Professor, #22251
Search Committee Chair:	Michael Slater
Search Committee Diversity Advocate:	William "Chip" Eveland
Search Committee Members:	Robert Bond, Emily Moyer Guse, ███████ (graduate student representative)

Submit this form by email:
*Date: **Must be sent prior to extending invitations to Columbus campus candidates for on-campus interviews***
To: Divisional Dean, Divisional Dean's Assistant
cc: Interim Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Korie Little Edwards, ███████████
Subject: Approval Request: Faculty Search Diversity Recruitment Report

Directions: Please provide a brief response to each question below.

1. APPLICATIONS AND COMMITTEE TRAINING

- When did the search committee chair and/or members attend one of the seven "Searching for Inclusive Excellence" workshops? Was there anyone on the search committee who did not? If so, why?

> Slater, Eveland, and Bond attended the 8/31 session of "Searching for Inclusive Excellence." Moyer-Guse attended on 9/27 and the graduate student representative (█████ attended on 10/18.
>
> Our graduate student representative did not participate in the search process until after she had attended training.

- Indicate the objective of this search [e.g. hire assistant professor in the field of [x] and the time period of the "active" search [e.g. October 2022-February 2023]:

> To hire an associate/full professor in the field of Communication (with an "open" focus that would align with one or more of the School's graduate emphasis areas of mass communication, health communication, new communication technology, or political communication. The time period of the search is from October 15, 2022 (initial stated deadline in ad) through the completion of the search, which is undetermined given the often lengthy process of recruiting senior faculty members. We began advertising for this position on August 10, 2022.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

- What populations are underrepresented in your department/school? Explain.

We compared the gender/sex data for our School to the NCES Earned Doctorates data. According to the NCES data, 54.8% of earned doctorates are earned by female persons while 45.2% are earned by male persons. Our faculty (N = 31) are 52% female persons (n = 16) and 48% male persons (n = 15). Exact parity with the NCES data would require ~17 female persons and ~14 male persons. Male persons are thus slightly overrepresented in our School, and female persons are slightly underrepresented in our School.

We also compared the race/ethnicity data for our School to the current NCES Earned Doctorates data. According to the most recent NCES data, 7.69% of earned doctorates are earned by Asian persons, 4.27% are earned by African-American persons, 1.71% are earned by Multi-racial persons, 70.94% are earned by White persons, and 5.98% are earned by persons who did not disclose. Our faculty are made up of 13% Asian persons (n= 4), 10% African-American persons (n = 3), 3% Multi-racial persons (n = 1), 65% White persons (n = 20), and 10% who did not disclose (n = 3). Exact parity with the NCES data would require ~3 Asian persons, ~2 African-American persons, ~1 multi-racial person, ~22 White persons, and ~2 persons who did not disclose. Thus, Asian persons and African-American persons are slightly overrepresented in our School and White persons are slightly underrepresented in our School relative to these norms from the current NCES data, though not of course relative to national population norms.

Comparisons of School data to NCES data based on Hispanic/Not Hispanic ethnicity were not possible due to inconsistent reporting between NCES and OSU data. Comparisons on Disability Status and Veteran Status were not possible due to a lack of reporting for the NCES data.

- What strategies did the search committee proactively employ to recruit faculty from underrepresented populations and diversify the applicant pool? Describe the impact of these strategies, as well as the challenges. Please be specific.

The College advertised the position on the following sites: Inside Higher Ed Careers; The National Directory of Diverse and Strategic Faculty; SREB Doctoral Scholars Directory; and The Minority Postdoc Doctoral Directory. The School of Communication advertised the position on the following sites: The AEJMC Website; The Chronicle; Diverse Jobs in Higher Education; The ICA Website; The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education; The NCA Website; and Communication and Media Studies Wiki. The AEJMC, ICA and NCA job listings reach the divisions with particular focus on diversity issues in each organization (e.g., Minorities and Communication division of AEJMC, Ethnicity and Race in Communication division of ICA, African American Communication and Culture and Feminist and Gender Studies divisions of NCA); these do not have separate job listing facilities.

In addition to advertising, we also made a concerted effort to reach out to potential candidates individually. The committee chair (Mike Slater) emailed the faculty a total of four times to request nominations; Slater emailed each nominated person individually. In each of these emails, Slater emphasized our desire for nominations of persons from under-represented minorities and asked that faculty provide such nominations. We received and emailed 38 potential candidates. Of these, 8 (a little over 20%) were Black or Latinx. (A ninth candidate was strongly recommended by two of our Black faculty, a South Asian with an outstanding record of research and leadership on diversity issues). Here is the breakdown:

	White	Black	Latinx	Asian	Row Totals
Male	15	2	0	0	17
Female	10	2	4	4	20
Column Totals	25	4	4	4	37

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Of the 29 non-minority nominees, 7 (or just under 25% of nominees) applied; four of six our shortlist candidates including one selected for campus interview came from these nominees. Of the eight minority candidates, none applied. Slater corresponded with most of these candidates. Several could not apply due to personal reasons (presumably family/partner issues but of course that was not discussed), but several who said they might otherwise be interested did not apply because they had just accepted an offer or counteroffer or had taken a senior university administrative role. The challenge this indicates is the intense demand for such diverse faculty and the corresponding challenge for recruitment.

- Did discussions about (i) diversity, equity and inclusion or (ii) broadening participation or related issues arise in any discussions during the search process? If so, describe the nature and outcome of such discussions.

The search committee had ongoing discussions about our interest in attracting and hiring new faculty members who represent diverse populations. There is consensus among the search committee and the faculty that this is a high priority for the School of Communication.

After attending the "Searching for Inclusive Excellence" workshop, the search committee met to discuss how we viewed diversity and inclusion in the context of this job call. We also discussed criteria for evaluating diversity statements, which applicants were required to submit as part of their application. As part of our preliminary Zoom interviews with our top 6 candidates, the committee included questions about DEI contributions, and we discussed our satisfaction with each applicant's response during a follow-up meeting. The candidates' responses to questions about DEI played a substantive role in our decision about who was selected to invite for campus interviews. Indeed, perhaps the majority of discussion surrounding how to narrow from our top 4 to our top 3 (for a campus interview) related to aspects of DEI contributions, with the ultimate decision being in favor of the candidate who contributed more to DEI relative to overall research impact.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

- Diversity statements were required by every candidate. How were the diversity statements evaluated as part of the review process?

 In addition to evaluating the diversity statement, we as a committee considered evidence of DEI in teaching statements, research statements, CVs, and cover letters. Some applicants discussed their commitments to DEI in various places, and we used such information to supplement the discussion in the DEI statement.

· We established the following concrete criteria to evaluate DEI in order to evaluate whether evidence presented in the application is consistent with the department's needs, interests, and job ad as they pertain to DEI.

- Research
- Do the topics/populations of the applicant's research address DEI (e.g., race, disability, gender, intersectionality, social equity)?
- Do the research practices that the applicant engages in address DEI concerns (e.g., the applicant demonstrates awareness of differences in experience/perspective based on race, gender, or other elements of diversity, and seeks to reflect a wide variety of experiences and perspectives where appropriate)?
- Is diversity, inclusion, social equity and/or disparities a focus of the candidate's research?

- Teaching
- Has the applicant taught classes on DEI topics (e.g., race in media)?
- Has the applicant incorporated DEI in their mentoring of students?
- Does the applicant address DEI in their courses where appropriate?
- Does the applicant discussed creating an inclusive culture in their classroom?
- Has the applicant completed teaching workshops, or other skills-based learning programs, designed to improve their adoption of DEI-advancing practices in their teaching

- Service
- Has the applicant engaged in service that has a positive impact on their communities in terms of improving social equity and representation within higher education?
- Has the applicant worked with non-profits or community groups with a DEI-focused mission?
- Has the applicant served on committees (e.g., of departments, colleges, or professional organizations) with a mission to address issues related to DEI?
- Has the applicant served in a leadership role in these regards

- Overall perspective
- Does the applicant provide concrete evidence of their dedication to advancing DEI?

 Candidates need not satisfy all criteria to be considered, as differences in approach may result in some variance.

· DEI, like teaching, research, and service, is an important evaluative criterion for determining the fit of an applicant to our job call, and the DEI statement was weighed equally with the teaching and research statements per College policy.

- Describe the applicant pool (using the EEO Report from Academic Jobs Online) from which the new hire will be selected. How satisfied are you with that pool and with its diversity? Please explain.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

We received 52 applications. According to the AJO report (attached), 30.77% of applicants were female. In terms of race/ethnicity, 20.7% of applicants were Asian, 56.9% were White, 5.17% were Black or African American, 3.85% were multiracial, 1.72% were American Indian or Alaskan Native, 1.72% were Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and 3.4% were Hispanic or Latino/a; 6.9% reported "other" and 5.17% declined (We note that the spreadsheet from the College reports slightly different pool percentages, slightly lower than in AJO; AJO is more accurate except with respect to multiracial as they double-count with other diversity identifiers.)

While it is difficult to find an exact basis for estimating diversity norms in the potential candidate pool, the most reasonable estimate we could identify was based on NCES data for 2010. We chose data from this year because we examined the mean and median for date of graduation for members of our pool who reported such data, excluding those who graduated in 2019 or later as they were not qualified for consideration for a tenured slot (some ABDs or very recent grads seemed to be applying without regard to the rank issue). The mean was between 2009 and 2010, and the median halfway between 2010 and 2011, so 2010 seemed the best estimate. While the "general communication" category was not a very precise match to our pool, numbers in more specific categories appeared too small to generate stable and reliable estimates for low base-rate minority numbers, so we used the general category. According to the 2010 NCES data for Communication earned doctorates, 4.2% were Hispanic/Latinx, 4.2% were African-American / Black, 1.5% were multi-racial, .03% were Native American, and 53.9% were White.

Given these demographics, our pool was over-represented by Asian applicants; other percentages appear relatively close to the NCES norms, though Hispanic/Latinx appears a bit low. We have traditionally had difficulty recruiting/retaining Latinx scholars given that Ohio is not seen as an optimal place to conduct research related to Latinx issues.

We note that 7.5% of applicants report disabilities, though there is no NCES base rate comparison data on this.

With respect to satisfaction -- feeling that we did as good a job as we could -- yes. With respect to the reality of diversity of the academic pool especially for a senior hire, it remains a frustrating and challenging situation.

✓ **Faculty Search Applicant Pool – Please attach the EEO Report for the position available in Academic Jobs Online (contact your college HR Consultant if you need assistance with this). If a different application portal was used, provide a report similar to the attached sample.**

2. SCREENING PROCESS

- Applicant pool check-ins

Date	Total Number of Applicants	Percent Underrepresented Sex	Percent Underrepresented Minorities
10/10/22	29	20.69% female 6.9% declined/unknown	13.33% Asian 3.33% Black / AA 10% declined 10% other 3.45% multiracial 3.44% Hispanic / Latinx
10/12/22	35	31.43% female 5.72% declined/unknown	2.44% American Indian / Alaskan Native 17.07% Asian 4.88% Black / AA 7.32% declined 9.76% other

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

			5.71% multiracial 2.86% Hispanic / Latinx
11/2/22	52	30.77% female 3.84% declined/unknown	1.72% American Indian / Alaskan Native 20.69% Asian 5.17% Black / AA 1.72% Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander 5.17% declined 6.90% other 3.85% multiracial 3.85 Hispanic / Latinx

- Describe the screening process and criteria employed in the evaluation of applications received.

All faculty search committee members independently screened applications and provided ratings for each applicant. Because this was a search for a tenured candidate, our first two and "required" characteristics were whether the candidate was trained in communication or closely aligned field, and whether the candidate was at least "probably tenurable" or "clearly tenurable" in our unit. Candidates considered "perhaps tenurable, but serious concerns" or "probably or clearly not tenurable" were not considered further.

Candidates who met these two initial thresholds were rated on eight additional factors. The first seven used a 5-Likert point scale, and were:

Consistent record of productivity/placement in major disciplinary/specialty journals (per APT)
Momentum promises continued productivity and placement based on trajectory, particularly in past 5 years
Research record would further the School's leadership in the social scientific study of communication [ie considered outstanding in discipline and/or subfield, moves School forward in methods/theory innovation/ability to address social problems and issues]
Research statement suggests future contributions in line with School strengths in tech, health/environment/social influence, mass comm uses/effects, political comm (note: this includes work on race/gender/equity touching any of these areas)
Solid teaching contribution and approach per teaching statement.
Diversity statements clearly describe demonstrated commitments to and record in diversity/equity/inclusion through research, teaching, mentorship, service, or /and outreach and engagement.
Appropriate service to unit and to discipline overall

Finally, each candidate was rated regarding their funding potential or record:

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

No evident interest or potential with respect to externally funded research	Statement or cover letter indicates interest and research record indicates potential to pursue such interest	Demonstrated potential for external funding in the future (experience as co-I and/or has submitted for external funding as PI)	Demonstrated track record of external funding (PI of at least one externally funded grant)	Strong record of external funding (PI of record of multiple grants or a very large grant eg $1 million plus)	Outstanding record of external funding (PI of record of multiple larger grants)	

Once these ratings were complete, committee members could nominate up to eight candidates for possible further consideration (i.e., a "top 8") and could also nominate any additional candidates that they perhaps did not endorse but wanted to discuss.

This process produced a list of:
  -three candidates nominated by all four committee members
  -one candidate nominated by three committee members
  -one candidate nominated by two committee members
  -six candidates nominated by one committee member
  -two additional candidates not nominated by identified as "to further discuss" by at least one committee member

The graduate student representative then reviewed the candidates on this list and provided (non-numerical) input. The search committee met, discussed each of these thirteen candidates in turn, and ultimately chose six candidates for Zoom interviews. We also did a final review of several applicants who completed applications after the Oct 15th soft deadline but before our final decisions, in case any were strong enough to merit consideration at that point. The following questions were asked of each of these six candidates in roughly 25 minute Zoom interviews:

1. Obviously, we are talking to you because we are excited about what you might bring to our program here at OSU. Why is it that you are interested in coming to Ohio State?
   a. [probe if not already answered]: What about Ohio State do you think would strengthen your research program and efforts? What professional challenges would you anticipate about such a move?
   b. What opportunities do you see here at Ohio State for continuing or expanding your efforts to obtain external support for your work?
2. You would be coming in as a tenured faculty member helping provide intellectual leadership in the School.
   a. What directions would you anticipate exploring in your research in the first few years after arriving here?
      i. How do you approach collaboration, within or outside the School?
   b. How do you approach mentorship, of junior faculty and of graduate students?
3. Diversity, equity, and inclusion is an important priority for the University, College, and School. Can you tell us a bit about your priorities in addressing DEI issues in your research, teaching, or service over the next few years?
4. What are some of the courses you most enjoy and value teaching?

Two days following the last of these Zoom interviews, the search committee met to discuss which three candidates should be chosen for campus interviews.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

- Complete the following table listing applicants who were _considered by the full faculty and not_ chosen for a campus interview. Provide your more expansive notes of evaluation of these candidates below.

Applicant's Name	Evaluation	Candidate submitted diversity statement: Yes/No
██████████ ██	████████ (Ph.D., 2002, University of Kansas) was a relatively senior scholar. His lifetime citation impact was strong (6947 via Google Scholar), but with other productivity and impact measures only comparable to several more junior applicants (h-index=39, i-10 index=50). Adjusted for a count since year of degree, his annual citations were mid-pack. He has published five flagships lifetime, but none in the past six years. His grant activity was low, with mostly small internal grants. ████████ teaching contributions and potential for advising were solid. Some were concerned that although he fit the position, as the Ph.D. advisor to one of our recently tenured faculty (with whom he has regularly collaborated) his contribution to the School might be largely in overlap with that current faculty member. ████████ DEI contributions were seen as perhaps above average among the short list, with specific efforts he has engaged in particularly in his teaching (as part of a program to reduce grade disparities in large classrooms) and his research emphasis on and in collaboration with faculty from the global south.	YES
██████████ ██	████ (Ph.D., 2013, University of North Carolina) was the most junior person on the short list based on years since Ph.D. Although her research area in health and entertainment media effects fits well within the School, her research impact was modest, even adjusted for time since degree (lifetime citations = 2014, h-index=25, i-10 index = 49). She has published only one article in a flagship journal, and none in the past six years. Although she has been involved in external research funding, her accomplishments in this domain were thought to be below what would be expected given other signals in her record that she is seeking to be a funding-driven scholar. ████████ teaching contributions and potential for advising were solid. Her DEI contributions are in line with most candidates in the pool but were not a particularly noteworthy aspect of her record compared to her other strengths.	YES
██████████ ██	████ (Ph.D., 1998, University of Alabama) was the most senior scholar of our short list (by a wide margin beyond most), and had the most lifetime cites (9257), but with other productivity and impact measures only comparable to several more junior applicants (h-index=36, i-10 index=54 via Google Scholar). Adjusted for a count since year of degree, his annual citations were mid-pack. He has published seven flagship papers lifetime, with three in the past 5-6 years. He also has a strong grant profile and is an award-winning teacher with extensive experience working with graduate advising and mentoring junior faculty. His alignment with the priorities for the position is strong, although some concern was raised among search committee members that his stated future direction in linking politics, morality, and entertainment might be too heavily	YES

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

overlapping with two current faculty who are also working in this hot but perhaps somewhat narrow area of the field. His DEI contributions are in line with most candidates in the pool but were not a particularly noteworthy aspect of his record compared to his other strengths.

3. PROPOSED INTERVIEW POOL

- Briefly describe the credentials of the candidates that you propose to bring as finalists to campus.

Candidate's Name	Description of Credentials	Candidate submitted diversity statement: Yes/No
███	███ (Ph.D., 2008, University of Pennsylvania) is very strong in research, with not only many publications but with many publications in flagship outlets (13 career, and five since 2017, averaging 0.93 per year since Ph.D.) Her research also has strong impact, with h-index=33, i-10 index=59, and 4288 lifetime cites (Google Scholar). She is/has been PI of multiple smaller and one $1.7MM EU grants, a Facebook grant, and co-I for a foundation grant. Her teaching, mentoring, and service also appear strong, and all of these both connect to and expand upon strengths currently within the School and in alignment with our call for the position. Also, a central part of ███ research emphasizes issues related to DEI, and her DEI statement and interview did reflect a concern and engagement with DEI issues. She spoke with genuine concern of her efforts working with many first-generation, usually URM students at UC Davis to help them make the transition to being successful at a major university.	YES
███	███ (Ph.D., 2012, University of Wisconsin) is very strong in research, among the three chosen for campus interview both the most recent Ph.D. but also the candidate appearing most like a rising star. She has been extremely productive, has a co-authored book under contract with Oxford, and has three lifetime flagship publications including one in '22 and one in '17. Her impact is also very impressive, especially considering time since degree, with h-index=34, i-10 index=57, and 5814 lifetime cites (Google Scholar). Given her trajectory, she was seen as having a very high potential ceiling. With regards to funding record, she has multiple large team grants ($1MM plus) from NSF, and various foundations, often as co-PI. Her industry collaborations were also seen as a distinctive strength. And, her research (she is emerging as a leading authority on misinformation) aligns nicely with the work being done in the School. Her DEI contributions are in line with other faculty in the pool but not a particularly noteworthy aspect of her record compared to her other strengths. Although she has been teaching at Georgetown where they have no Ph.D. program and a very small faculty in Communication, her research track record suggests considerable potential as a graduate mentor.	YES
███	███ (Ph.D., 2010, University of Wisconsin) has solid productivity and impact for her career stage (h-index=26, i-10 index=35, 3239 lifetime cites per Google Scholar). She recently was part of a team that received a significant external grant regarding misinformation in excess of $1 million. She has considerable experience in graduate advising and teaching interests that range across several areas of the	YES

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

▮▮	School (health and political communication), including an expressed interest in continuing to teach upper-level public relations courses that could uniquely benefit the School. Several members of the search committee were particularly impressed with ▮▮ prior and future contributions to DEI (as Associate Editor and now Editor of *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* where she has implemented some strong DEI initiatives, plus an expressed desire to seek out future leadership opportunities where she could actively work to improve DEI). One search committee member felt that her strengths and interests regarding equity, disparity, and inclusion were primarily focused on the global South and on campus, international students, as well as women's issues. Others saw this international focus an important contribution to the School after the loss of our only international-focused scholar two years ago.	

- For each candidate chosen for a campus interview, briefly describe how each candidate would amplify the values of diversity, inclusion and innovation. How does the candidate's teaching, mentoring, research, and/or outreach and engagement amplify diversity and inclusion? How would the candidate contribute to ongoing or new diversity and inclusion initiatives in the unit?

Name	Description
▮▮	▮▮ was born in Poland, earned her Ph.D. in the U.S., had her first faculty position in Spain, her second faculty position in the Netherlands, and is currently a professor in the U.S. This experience as an immigrant, and experience across a diverse range of cultures, is important to her perspective on DEI. A central part of ▮▮ research emphasizes issues related to DEI, including work on sexual minority rights and understanding how to promote greater respect for difference, and work on how to reduce prejudice against immigrants and gays and lesbians. Her research has also examined intergroup contact (interpersonal and mediated) and how it can alter perceptions of outgroup threat. Her teaching actively employs a number of strategies to address DEI, including role-playing exercises on responding to overt displays of prejudice. She spoke with genuine concern of her efforts working with many first-generation, usually URM students at UC-Davis (where she is currently employed, and which has a large proportion of URM students) to help them make the transition to being successful at a major university. She has participated in a number of workshops related to DEI issues. ▮▮ would be a sensible person to lead the School's DEI Committee.
▮▮	▮▮ DEI contributions are in line with other faculty in the pool but not a particularly noteworthy aspect of her record compared to her other strengths. She describes her firsthand experience with issues related to sexism as her most direct experience with DEI issues. She played a foundational role at Georgetown University (where she currently works) in developing a sexual assault and misconduct survey, and served as a member of their sexual assault task force. She also served as a mentor to the Georgetown's Women's Alliance. Her research also examines some gender-related issues (e.g., closing the political participation gap between men and women) and how to empower minorities who are the target of disinformation campaigns.
▮▮	▮▮ research tackles a number of DEI issues, including media representation of refugees, gender issues, news framing of white supremacy and the alt-right movement, and the #MeToo movement. Several members of the search committee were particularly impressed with Borah's prior and future contributions to DEI as Associate Editor and now Editor of *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. There she has set author guidelines that require citations from diverse authors (gender, race and geography) and built an editorial board that is diverse. ▮▮ also signaled a strong desire to (as a BIPOC woman) take on other leadership roles that would put her in a position to make structural changes to advance DEI. ▮▮ would be a sensible person to lead the School's DEI Committee, and perhaps

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

| | take on other leadership roles in the School and College to pursue her DEI goals. We note that the strength of Dr. ███████ commitment with respect to DEI issues was an important factor in the committee's decision to offer her a campus interview. |

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES