

FACULTY SEARCH DIVERSITY RECRUITMENT REPORT 2022-2023

Position Title and Number:	Freshwater Biologist / Dept EEOB AJO: OSU-Evolution, Ecology and Organismal Biology-FB [#22364]
Search Committee Chair:	Roman Lanno (EEOB Faculty)
Search Committee Diversity Advocate:	Rachelle Adams (EEOB Faculty)
Search Committee Members:	Meg Daly (EEOB Faculty) Gerry Carter (EEOB Faculty) [REDACTED] Graduate Student)

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, [REDACTED]

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?

<p>Searching for Inclusive Excellence Roman Lanno [21 Sept 2022] Rachelle Adams [18 Oct. 2022] Meg Daly [21 Sept 2022] Gerry Carter [21 Sept 2022] Devan Mathie [15 Sept. 2022]</p> <p>Completed Implicit Bias Training [https://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/implicit-bias-training] Rachelle Adams Devan Mathie Meg Daly Gerry Carter Roman Lanno</p>



- 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]:

Hire an Assistant Professor in the field of freshwater biology. Time period of search is August 2022 to February 2023

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

EEOB currently has a total of 19 full-time tenure track faculty members on the Columbus campus. These include 12 men (63%) and 7 women (37%). These include 4 faculty (21%) who are non-white.

We assessed the diversity of our current department using as a reference a summary of the IPEDS Degree completion data sets from 2015 – 2019 for all categories containing the terms Evolution or Ecology.

These included:

Ecology (26.1301)

Evolutionary Biology (26.1303)

Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (26.1310)

Ecology, Evolution, Systematics and Population Biology (26.1399)

This pooled data set showed a total of 851 men (48%) and 904 (52%) women. A statistical comparison using a Chi-square test shows no difference in relative proportion between proportion of men: women in all full-time EEOB faculty relative to the reference population (Chi-square = 1.62; $p = 0.20$). In terms of racial categories of white versus non-white the pooled reference data set showed a total of 1140 (83%) white PhD students and 228 (17%) non-white students (where race could be determined). Again, a Chi-square analyses shows no difference in relative portion of white: non-white category relative to the reference population (Chi-square = 0.26; $p = 0.61$). Thus, broadly speaking the composition of our department matches the current candidate pool of potential hires.

The composition of our department is also similar to data from AAU peer institutions, as provided to us by OSU's Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, although in this case statistical comparisons are not possible. For comparison, those faculty percentages stand at 60% male and 40% female, 17% of whom are non-white.

However, we also note that in early 2023, faculty retirements will leave EEOB's Columbus campus with 12 men (71%) and 5 women (29%), while also raising the percent of non-white faculty slightly to 24%. While a statistical comparison using a Chi-square test still shows EEOB's faculty gender ratio to be not statistically different than the pool of PhDs in this field (Chi-square = 3.29; $p = 0.11$) **the numbers do show how a small number of retirements in a small department like ours can have a substantial impact in reducing diversity.**

In summary, although EEOB is generally representative of the pool of recent PhD graduates and is on par with AAU peer institutions, the gender ratio of our faculty will soon be shifting in the direction of **female faculty being underrepresented**. This is clearly an important dimension of diversity that we have been considering and will continue to consider when assessing faculty candidates.



- 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.

Ad Posting

General subdiscipline boards

- Posted on LinkedIn by Roman Lanno
- EEB jobs wiki (Ecoevojobs.net: This google spreadsheet is very widely used by individuals searching for faculty positions in EEB)
- Academic Careers – [Diversity Package](#)
- American Fisheries Society job board
- ECOLOG
- International Association for Great Lakes Research
- Society for Freshwater Science
- Society of Wetland Scientists

Diversity targeted boards

- Black Ecologists section of Ecological Society of America
- Women of Color and Non-Binary People of Color in Ecology and Evolution
- We did not post on SACNAS (Advancing Chicanos/Hispanics & Native Americans in Science) or AISES (American Indian Science and Engineering Society) because of the associated costs and concerns about the relative reward of posting on these job boards. Andreas Chavez (EEOB faculty) reached out to a DEI Slack group about the efficacy of posting on these sites. He asked: could we reach applicants through SACNAS or AISES boards that could not be reached through our other postings? The consensus was that our efforts would reach the intended audience without posting on SACNAS/AISES (i.e., most applicants use the EEB jobs wiki and not the SACNAS jobs board)

Targeted invitations

- Roman Lanno sent 6 personal emails to individuals (all woman and/or minorities) found on diversifyeeb.com Academic Directory (used to help identify diverse ecologists)

Process

1. Faculty on the committee have been engaged in DEI issues, workshops, book clubs, etc. in EEOB for multiple years. Two of us helped lead a recent seminar course/discussion on Racism in Fall 2020. Adams participated in several book clubs organized through EEOB or the larger community about inclusive teaching, stereotype threat, and racial inequity in America. Daly has been involved in building faculty diversity through targeted hires and has participated in book clubs, seminar series, and trainings to support this activity and her roles as vice chair for graduate studies and associate dean for undergraduate education. Adams, as chair, and Carter have served on the EEOB Diversity Committee. As president of the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry North America, one of Lanno's major initiatives was establishing the Inclusive Diversity Committee charged with providing programs that are specifically targeted to underrepresented groups at SETAC North America meetings and serving as a focal point for interaction among these affinity groups.
2. All committee members have successfully completed the Implicit Bias Training offered by the Kirwan Institute.
3. The committee has worked with the current EEOB Diversity Committee to embrace the stated goal of the department to enhance diversity in activities such as job searches.
4. The committee has developed and discussed DEI rubrics and chose one to use to evaluate candidates. We also discussed the importance of the relative weight given to research, teaching, mentoring, service, and advancement of diversity. As a committee we agreed on the categories within the rubric and the relative weight of DEI activities within the ranking metrics at each stage.

- 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.

Yes. We discussed DEI and broadening participation as a committee and also in smaller informal meetings during the entire process.

Highlights of our process:

We gave considerable thought to where we posted the advertisement and how to both reach the widest audience in a cost-effective manner and target individuals who might be strong candidates and broaden participation (see information above in the “search strategies box” above). One specific outcome of these discussions was the finding that the majority of potential applicants were finding information about jobs and tracking the progress of job searches nationwide with the [EEB Jobs Wiki](#). Thus, we focused our efforts on posting ads on both general and discipline specific boards and then targeting specific individuals with personal emails.

While developing the Candidate Ranking Form (Addendum 1) and choosing the DEI rubric (Addendum 2), we discussed our overall approach. We decided that each of us would evaluate approximately two-thirds of all candidates (three evaluations/candidate; 32 applicants; see Addendum 3 – AJO Diversity summary) plus 5 applicants shared from the Aquatic Population/Community Ecology (APCE) search pool that did not appear in the Freshwater Biology (FB) pool summary (37 in total) in our first round of review. At this stage we did not read the letters of recommendation but used all other required documents to rank candidates (top third, middle third, bottom third, or not acceptable). After extensive discussion as a committee, we narrowed our list to 10 candidates, excluding junior candidates and those interviewing for the APCE position.

Our short list was an extremely diverse pool of highly qualified applicants: 7 female:4 male; Japanese, Puerto Rican-Spanish, first generation American from Eastern Europe; one person identified as a member of the LGBTQ+ community and two identified as disabled; two were close to or were Associate Professors, three were Assistant Professors at undergraduate-serving universities, four were postdoctoral scholars, and one was a research scientist. At this time, all committee members carefully evaluated our top 10 applicants. Detailed evaluation of the applicants was based upon a weighted rubric of 67% research and 33% contribution to DEI. We all agreed that all applicants being considered in this final group demonstrated adequate teaching capabilities and by eliminating this factor from further consideration, we were able to more fairly evaluate applicants at different stages in their careers.

Regardless of the stage in our assessment process, the potential for enhancing DEI was discussed for every applicant. The committee reflected on why some applicants had relatively high DEI scores whereas others did not. We considered the career stage of the applicant, their life experience as it relates to their specified identity, and the opportunity or lack of opportunity for an applicant to engage in DEI initiatives during their career. Our process allowed us to contextualize our rubric scores to ensure that each person was evaluated as fairly as possible with respect to DEI understanding and initiatives.

The three top candidates reflect a range of diverse identities and perspectives to enhance diversity. One candidate identifies as Japanese and shared his experience as an international scholar. Another candidate identifies as a member of the LGBTQ+ community, describes her use of inclusive teaching methods, and participates in programs focused on diversifying STEM. Our third candidate is Puerto Rican-Spanish, and he has taught Latinx students and mentored and trained students from a wide range of countries. Finally, we also identified a fourth, alternate, candidate (female) that has worked to promote diversity at the faculty level by serving on hiring committees and through leadership of a program focused on the recruitment of minority and first-generation graduate students to graduate school. This slate of candidates was presented to EEOB faculty, and the top three and one alternate were approved by a unanimous vote.

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

Evaluating diversity statements, as well as other DEI-related text in other parts of applicant files, was an important component of our review process. Each Diversity Statement was screened twice, both times following the rubric developed by Emory College (see Addendum 2). Following the initial screening, the committee discussed whether to make any changes to our DEI rubric and we all agreed the chosen rubric was appropriate for the second assessment.

First assessment (top third, middle third, bottom third, or not acceptable):

- A. Research accomplishments, as evidenced by publications in refereed journals, presentations at meetings, and research recognitions, given place in career. 30%
- B. Record of research funding, given place in career, and potential for building a funding portfolio in this position. 20%
- C. Potential in graduate education, training and mentoring. 15%
- D. Demonstrated excellence in or potential for teaching in EEOB. 10%
- E. Potential to have positive impact on diversity (separate rubric). 20%
- F. Potential for service and leadership. 5%

Second assessment (ranking of 10 final applicants):

- A. Research accomplishments and funding, as evidenced by publications and funding portfolio, presentations at meetings, and research recognitions, given place in career. 66.6%
- B. Potential to have positive impact on diversity, given place in career and opportunity (see Addendum 2 for rubric). 33.4%

Summary of key components of our rubric:

Valuing and Understanding DEI (up to 5 pts)

Vocalizes understanding that antiracism practices require long-term growth, reflection and engagement; demonstrates understanding of the many dimensions of diversity and intersectionality; willing to discuss and confront DEI challenges; recognizes role of faculty to shape lab/classroom/department/university/community

Track Record in Advancing DEI (up to 5 pts)

Continuous participation in advancing DEI; DEI leadership that extends beyond lab (e.g., department); demonstrates leadership role in past groups/projects that support underrepresented trainees at various levels (undergrad, grad, postdoc)

Track Record in Mentoring Diverse Trainees (up to 5 pts)

Continuous commitment towards evaluating and assessing inclusive teaching practices; long-term engagement in mentoring programs (e.g., LSAMP); evidence of inclusive teaching (e.g., syllabus, approach)

Plans for Advancing DEI (up to 5 pts)

Clear plans for evaluating impact of DEI practices; addresses multiple areas (classroom, lab, conferences); presents ways research, teaching, and service advance DEI

When determining our top five and then top three (plus one alternate) candidates, the committee agreed that all individuals have the potential to be successful OSU faculty. We also agreed that the most experienced applicants that held Assistant Professor positions at undergraduate-serving institutions will have capacity to not only build a research program, easily teach core EEOB courses, but also continue with DEI enhancement. Secondly to their overall excellence, our top candidates were two women, two non-white men, and one member of the LGBTQ+ community; we recognize that these are self-reported identities that may not reflect the breath or intersectionality of their identities.

- 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 report for this search can be found in Addendum 3. Numbers of male: female candidates were 23 (62%): 14 (38%). Numbers of white: non-white candidates were: 33 (89%): 4 (11%). Note that these numbers include 5 candidates included from the APCE position search (3 female, 2 male; all white).

We evaluated these numbers against two pools of potential candidates. One a “Broad” Reference pool which consists of a summary of the IPDES Degree completion data sets from 2015 – 2019 for all categories containing the terms Evolution or Ecology. These included Ecology (26.1301), Evolutionary Biology (26.1303), Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (26.1310), and Ecology, Evolution, Systematics and Population Biology (26.1399) (see above). The second was a “Narrow” discipline focused pool in the areas of Natural Resource Management and Fisheries which is the specific area targeted by our position. This included IPDES Degree completion data sets from 2015-2019 for the following categories: 03.0101 Natural Resources/Conservation, General; 03.0301 Fishing and Fisheries Sciences and Management; 03.0601 Wildlife, Fish and Wildlands Science and Management.

With respect to the Broad pool: The candidate pool is not significantly different in either gender (Candidates (M:F): 23(62%): 14(38%) vs Broad (M:F): 851 (48%): 904 (52%) (Chi Square = 2.7; p = 0.10) or representation of White versus Non-white candidates (Candidates (W: non-W): 33 (89%): 4 (11%) vs Broad (W: non-W): 1140 (83%): 228 (17%) (Chi-square = 0.90; p = 0.34).

With respect to the Narrow discipline focused pool: The candidate pool is not significantly different in either gender (Narrow pool – M:F = 454 (53%): 400 (47%); comparison with candidate pool: Chi-square = 1.15; p = 0.28) or race (Narrow pool – W: non-W = 537 (88%): 70 (12%); comparison with candidate pool: Chi-square = 0.02; p = 0.89).

In summary, our candidate pool in general reflects both the broad and narrow discipline pools with respect to gender and race in the field of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology as a whole.

We also note that while the demographic makeup of our candidate pool was generally similar to that of recent earned doctorates in the subdiscipline from which we are recruiting from for this position, **we acknowledge** that the demographics of these pools diverge from that of the overall US population and that **there is more work to be done before the faculty in EEOB is representative of diversity of the US.**

2. SCREENING PROCESS

- Applicant pool check-ins

Date	Total Number of Applicants	Percent Underrepresented Sex	Percent Underrepresented Minorities
11 November 2022	37	38% (23:14, M:F)	11% (33:4, W:NW)
21 November 2022	10	60% (4:6, M:F)	20% (8:2, W:NW)

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

First, we conducted an initial assessment of all 37 applicants using the Candidate Ranking Form (Addendum 1) and DEI rubric (Addendum 2). Each committee member evaluated approximately two-thirds of all candidates (three evaluations/candidate; 32 applicants plus 5 applicants shared from the APCE search pool that did not appear in the FB pool summary) in our first round of review. At this stage we did not read the letters of recommendation but used all other required documents to rank candidates (top third, middle third, bottom third, or not acceptable) with respect to research, funding, graduate education, teaching, impact on diversity, and service and leadership (as described below). Mean rank scores were used to begin discussions and after extensive deliberations as a committee, we narrowed our list to 10 candidates, excluding junior candidates and those interviewing for the APCE position.

First assessment (top third, middle third, bottom third, or not acceptable):

- Research accomplishments, as evidenced by publications in refereed journals, presentations at meetings, and research recognitions, given place in career. 30%
- Record of research funding, given place in career, and potential for building a funding portfolio in this position. 20%

- C. Potential in graduate education, training and mentoring. 15%
- D. Demonstrated excellence in or potential for teaching in EEOB. 10%
- E. Potential to have positive impact on diversity (separate rubric). 20%
- F. Potential for service and leadership. 5%

Our short list was an extremely diverse pool of highly qualified applicants: 6 female:4 male; Japanese, Puerto Rican-Spanish, first generation American from Eastern Europe; one person identified as a member of the LGBTQ+ community and two identified as disabled; two were close to or were Associate Professors, three were Assistant Professors at undergraduate-serving universities, four were postdoctoral scholars, and one was a research scientist. At this time, all committee members carefully evaluated our top 10 applicants. Detailed evaluation of the applicants was based upon a weighted rubric of 67% research and 33% contribution to DEI (see below). We all agreed that all applicants being considered in this final group demonstrated adequate teaching capabilities and by eliminating this factor from further consideration, we were able to more fairly evaluate applicants at different stages in their careers. We used mean rank scores to begin deliberations and achieved a consensus on the final three applicants, plus one alternate, that would be proposed to the full EEOB faculty for approval.

Second assessment (ranking of 10 final applicants):

- A. Research accomplishments and funding, as evidenced by publications and funding portfolio, presentations at meetings, and research recognitions, given place in career. 66.6%
- B. Potential to have positive impact on diversity, given place in career and opportunity (see Addendum 2 for rubric). 33.4%

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
1. [REDACTED]	Assistant Professor, U of Dayton, (2020-present); National Institutes of Health NRSA postdoctoral fellow, U Illinois Urbana-Champaign (2017-2020); Post-doc researcher, U Illinois Urbana-Champaign (2016); PhD, Ohio State University (2016) Research Accomplishments: 27 peer-reviewed articles, 13 first author, (Proc Royal Soc B, Animal Behav, Behav Ecol Sociobiol, J Animal Ecol, Trends Ecol Evol, JFB, Behav); 20 invited presentations, 18 presentations Grant funding: NIH PDF (\$182K); local (City of Dayton, \$30K), NIH, NSF, submitted Instructor: Ecology, Evolution, Physiology; Mentoring experience: 1 PhD, 1 MS student; 9 UG students	Yes
2. [REDACTED]	Assistant Professor, U Tennessee-Chatanooga, Research Associate, LSU Museum of Natural Science (2019- present); Post-doc/lab manager, LSU Museum of Natural Science (2015-2018); Post-doc, Tulane University (2014-2015); Post-doc, Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Panama (2012-2104); PhD: Universidad Complutense Madrid, Spain (2009) Research Accomplishments: 50 peer-reviewed articles, 16 first author; 4 book chapters; 36 presentations at meetings; 12 invited talks Grant funding: \$590K (converted) grants from Spanish government; \$120K - UTC Center of Excellence in Applied Computer Science and Engineering Instructor: Genetics, Evolution, Molecular Evolution and Ecology, Principles of Biology, Population Genetics, Phylogeography Mentoring experience: 1 MS (UT-C), 17 UG students (UT-C, LSU)	Yes

3. [REDACTED]	<p>Assistant Professor, UNC-Greensboro (2019– present); Post-doc Minnesota (2017-2019), Post-doc, Hokkaido, Japan (2014-2017); PhD: Tokyo (2014)</p> <p>Research Accomplishments: 36 peer-reviewed articles, 17 first-author (Ecography, PNAS, Water, Ecol Engineer, Ecol Res, Biodiv Conserv, Conserv Biol), 1 book chapter; 42 presentations, 15 invited seminars</p> <p>Grant funding: NSF \$380K, Syngenta (\$200K)</p> <p>Instructor: Aquatic Ecology, Current Topics in Biology, Ecology, some workshops</p> <p>Mentoring experience: 4 post-docs, 3 MS, 1 UG</p>	Yes
4. [REDACTED] (alternate)	<p>Marie Skłodowska Curie Postdoctoral Fellow, EAWAG, Switzerland (2021-present); Alexander von Humboldt Postdoctoral Fellow, Max Planck Institute of Animal Behavior and U of Konstanz, Germany (2018-2021); PhD, Cornell, 2018</p> <p>Research Accomplishments: 29 peer-reviewed articles, 14 first-author (PNAS, Trends Ecol Evol, Nature Climate Change, Frontiers Ecol Evol, L&O, Current Biol, Oikos, FW Biol, ES&T); 21 presentations;</p> <p>Grant funding: Marie Skłodowska Curie Fellowship, European Commission, (\$161K fellowship support, \$20,380 in research support) Humboldt Postdoctoral Research Fellowship (\$99.8K fellowship, \$19.2K research support); USDA Hatch collaborator (\$60,000)</p> <p>Instructor: Guest lecturer/TA: Limnology, Physiological Ecology, Ornithology, Stream Ecology</p> <p>Mentoring experience: 8 UG researchers</p>	Yes

- 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
1. [REDACTED]	<p>As a woman in science and a member of the LGBTQ+ community, Dr. [REDACTED] has an impressive track record of advancing DEI through mentorship and the participation and leadership of activities aimed at increasing and retaining diversity in science (e.g., ‘Girls do Science’ club; LGBTQ mentor & panel member). She has led a survey about classroom climate and uses inclusive teaching practices. She states her strategies to continue to integrate diversity in her curriculum and student mentoring while additionally seeking opportunities to contribute to and help establish new OSU LGBTQ+ organizations sponsored by the Center for Belonging and Social Change. DEI rubric score average: 18.3</p>
2. [REDACTED]	<p>Dr. [REDACTED] is a Puerto Rican-Spanish scientist with a strong international research ties and record for training students from Morocco, Algeria, and Latin American countries. He is a member of his department’s DEI committee and has taken complementary workshops about inclusive teaching. He has also participated in a K-12 program aimed at social and economically disadvantaged in Panama. He plans to continue creating respectful and diverse working environments and would like to contribute to the Office of Diversity and Inclusion at OSU. DEI rubric score average: 14.8</p>
3. [REDACTED]	<p>Dr. [REDACTED] rui is Japanese and empathetic to challenges international students face due to cultural differences. He has a track record of mentoring with this awareness, and plans to continue to recruit diverse lab members. In the classroom he increases accessibility and equity. DEI rubric score average: 12.1</p>
4. [REDACTED] (alternate)	<p>Dr. [REDACTED] a woman in science, wrote a compelling DEI statement emphasizing the importance of recognizing the long history of exclusion, inequality, and white supremacy in academic institutions. She has worked broadly to improve diversity in her lab, classroom, and at the institutional level (e.g., led Enviro-mentoring at Cornell and wrote grants to fund equity initiatives at society conferences). She has mentored BIPOC undergraduates through honors theses and plans to continue her equity work by taking on senior society leadership and editorial roles. DEI rubric score average: 16</p>

Summary Table of Aggregate Data of Proposed Interview Pool (including alternate) (from Academic Jobs Online - FB Report)

	Female	Male	Sex Unidentified	TOTAL		Disability Status=Yes	Veteran Status=Yes
American Indian or Alaska Native					American Indian or Alaska Native		
Asian		1			Asian		
Black or African American					Black or African American		
Hispanic or Latino(a)		1			Hispanic or Latino(a)		
International Applicant					International Applicant		
Pacific Islander					Pacific Islander		
Two or More Races					Two or More Races		
White	2				White		
Race Not Identified					Race Not Identified		
Disability Status=Yes					-	-	-
Veteran Status=Yes					-	-	-
TOTAL	2	2					

Candidate:	Reviewer:	Rating	0
Education:			
Current and previous post-graduate positions:			
Research areas, expertise, skills:			
Potential for research to align with this position: contributions in E, E, or OB and freshwater biology		Fit - Y, N, ?	
	3 = top third, 2 = middle third; 1 = bottom third, 0 = unacceptable		
Criteria		Rating	Weight
Research accomplishments, as evidenced by publications in refereed journals, quality of journals, presentations at meetings, and research recognition, given their career stage and funding/resource availability			30%
Strengths:			
Potential or explicitly stated limitations and/or barriers:			
Record of research funding (federal grants, state level grants, other sources (>\$50K)) given their career stage, and potential or need for building a funding portfolio in their position			20%
Strengths:			
Potential or explicitly stated limitations and/or barriers:			
Demonstrated excellence in or potential for teaching in EEOB			15%
Strengths:			
Potential or explicitly stated limitations and/or barriers:			
Potential in undergraduate and graduate education, training and mentoring			10%
Strengths:			
Potential or explicitly stated limitations and/or barriers:			
Potential to enhance DEI within the institution and discipline - Does the applicant have a record that reflects leadership or the potential for leadership in DEI efforts? Do they provide evidence for being an ally or active player in social justice/equity work? Is there evidence for broad involvement with diversity work on campus, in their community, or nationally? Evidence of skill building and personal growth around DEI (outreach, mentoring, LSAMP involvement, etc)? Demonstrated commitment to encouraging divergent thinking in the workplace? * Use DEI rubric and present score up to 20.			20%
Strengths:			
Potential or explicitly stated limitations and/or barriers:			
Potential for service and leadership			5%
Strengths:			
Potential or explicitly stated limitations and/or barriers:			
Comments:			

Rubric to Assess Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Statements

Please note, this rubric is not meant to be a prescriptive tool. To achieve the best outcomes, we recommend that committees using this rubric should preemptively discuss the specific needs of their department and calibrate the rubric accordingly. During the assessment process, reviewers should use the rubric score *and* discuss the content of the DEI statement to holistically assess each candidate (i.e., the rubric score alone should not determine a candidate's ranking).

Problematic Approaches	
0	<i>Solely</i> focuses on how their teaching, research, and/or service could theoretically address DEI, but the ideas are not entirely novel, feasible, practical, or impactful
	<i>Solely</i> focuses on their belonging to an underrepresented group as evidence they completely understand barriers other individuals could face in the academy
	<i>Solely</i> acknowledges that racism, classism, etc. are issues in the academy
	<i>Solely</i> discusses how they are knowledgeable about DEI through passive participation in a few workshops, sessions, reading groups, etc.
	<i>Solely</i> provides personal anecdotes about how they have been discriminated against or have discriminated against someone as evidence they value and understand DEI

Valuing and Understanding Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	
1-2	Has given little to no effort on increasing their knowledge/understanding of DEI-related topics through workshops, communication, etc.
	Simply discusses DEI in vague terms and does not describe how they would work to improve DEI in their lab/classroom/department/university/community
3	Recognizes and places significance on their role as a faculty member in shaping and supporting DEI efforts in their lab/classroom/department/university/community
	Expresses willingness to discuss and confront challenges related to advancing DEI practices with the broader community of undergraduates, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, faculty, and staff
4-5	Demonstrates an understanding that diversity has many dimensions (e.g., ethnic, socioeconomic, racial, gender, sexual orientation, disability, cultural differences, etc.) and that individuals have unique experiences given their intersectionality along these dimensions
	Vocalizes that antiracism practices requires consistent and long-term growth, reflection, and engagement (and that they are prepared to put in this work)

Track Record in Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	
Note: For this section, keep in mind that individuals may come from departments that were hostile to DEI-related activities, so they may not have felt comfortable participating.	
1-2	Has invested little time in advancing DEI beyond basic expectations for their academic rank or institutional climate
	Passively describes past participation in workshops, committees, etc. and does not describe the purpose, outcome, or their specific role in such events or organizations
3	Shows limited participation in single activity but provides a clearer description of the objectives/results of activity and/or the individual role they played

4-5	Demonstrates strong leadership role in past groups/projects that support underrepresented students at various levels (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral)
	Leadership in DEI extends to organizing events aimed at the departmental level to increase representation and better support underrepresented students as well as colleagues
	Documents continuous participation in events or organizations geared towards advancing DEI (can include work completed outside of academia, e.g., community activism) during multiple career stages

Track Record in Mentoring Diverse Trainees

Note: For this section, keep in mind the difference between diverse and BIPOC (black, indigenous, and people of color). I.e., a white male who mentors a white woman 10 years their senior can honestly say they mentored a diverse trainee however has no interaction with trainees from historically underrepresented groups in STEM and therefore cannot advocate or be an ally for these trainees.

1-2	Briefly mentions inclusion in curriculum, but has no plans to implement additional teaching strategies that enhance inclusion
	Shows little evidence of personal actions taken to mentor diverse students in the classroom or the lab (e.g., I had a diverse classroom and they did fine)
3	Has taken a few workshops dedicated to enhancing intercultural or intergroup competencies and skills
4-5	Demonstrates evidence (through specific strategies) of how they have updated their syllabus, teaching approach, course curriculum, etc. to enhance representation and retention of underrepresented groups
	Demonstrates engagement in long-term mentorship program(s) that supports underrepresented groups
	Identifies continued commitment towards evaluating and assessing inclusive teaching practices and offers suggestions on how

Plans for Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

1-2	Does not verbalize a plan for advancing DEI beyond general expectations for all faculty as outlined by the department (no personal agency or motivation)
	Describes a vague plan for how they will create an inclusive classroom or lab space without clear actionable items that they intend to accomplish to reach that goal. The plan lacks detail/purpose (e.g., if "outreach" is proposed, there is no mention of the specific target, the type of engagement, or expected outcomes)
3	Mentions plans or ideas they intend to implement to advance DEI and provides clear and detailed ideas for what existing programs they would get involved with (with reference to current activities/limitations) as appropriate for their academic rank
4-5	Presents ways in which their research, teaching, and/or service will advance DEI in the university, their academic societies, or the broader community
	Addresses multiple areas of need (e.g., classroom climate, the laboratory, conferences)
	Presents clear way of evaluating plans along with their impact. May also describe the growth of their plan over time

This rubric has been adapted from [UC Berkeley's Rubric for Assessing Candidate Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion](#). The adapted rubric was developed by Kyle A. Thomas (currently a graduate student in the Biomedical Engineering Department at Emory University and the Georgia Institute of Technology) and Karena H. Nguyen (currently a postdoctoral fellow in the Biology Department at Emory University). Thomas and Nguyen have also published the article "[A model for diversifying faculty recruitment](#)" in the journal *Nature*. Additional sources for this adapted rubric include [University of Michigan Center for Research on Learning and Teaching \(CRLT\) and Rackham Graduate School's Diversity Statement Evaluation Rubric](#), [5 Don'ts in Writing Your DEI Statement](#), and Sylvester et al. 2019 ([DOI: https://doi.org/10.3998/currents.17387731.0001.112](https://doi.org/10.3998/currents.17387731.0001.112)).