

## FACULTY SEARCH DIVERSITY RECRUITMENT REPORT 2022-2023

<b>Position Title and Number:</b>	Developmental Biology , Cell Biology, and/or Molecular Epigenetics (2 assistant professor faculty positions) AJO 22220
<b>Search Committee Chair:</b>	Susan Cole.354
<b>Search Committee Diversity Advocate:</b>	Hay-Oak Park.294
<b>Search Committee Members:</b>	David Bisaro.1 Craig Burd.7 Anna Dobritsa.1 Vidu Garg.6

**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?

Chair Susan Cole and Department Vice Chair for Research Sharon Amacher attended the 2 hour **Building a Successful and Inclusive Search** training on July 26th, 2022. Committee members David Bisaro, Craig Burd, Anna Dobritsa, and Vidu Garg attended the **Searching for Inclusive Excellence** training on August 31st, 2022 while Susan Cole and Hay-Oak Park attended the session on September 15th, 2022.

- 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 one Assistant Professor in Developmental and/or Cell Biology (Department of Molecular Genetics) and one Assistant Professor in Molecular Epigenetics (Department of Molecular Genetics). Given the expectation that many candidates might be appropriate for both searches a joint committee was established to screen applicants for the two searches.

Period of active search is expected to be: Evaluate files September 19-October 28, 2022; Interview candidates November-March 2023; Second visit and negotiations, until the positions are filled.



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

The Molecular Genetics departmental demographic data for tenure track faculty with TIUs in the department (this data was accessed in October 2022, but includes two junior faculty hires who will start in January 2023)

- 69% white, 22% Asian, and 9% undisclosed
- 65% male and 35% female
- 65% US citizen (61% native, 4% naturalized), 26% permanent resident alien, and 9% undisclosed

This group is under-represented for women, Hispanic/Latino, Black/African American, Native American/Alaskan Native, and Pacific Islander

- 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.

#### **Strategies**

1) Wide advertisement: In addition to the ASC advertisements in the National Registry of Diverse & Strategic Faculty ("The Registry"), SREB Compact for Faculty Diversity Scholars Directory, Inside Higher Ed, and Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC), we placed advertisements in the following venues:

- The Chronicle of Higher Education
- Association for Women in Science (AWIS) Job Bank
- American Indian Science & Engineering Society (AISES) Job Board
- Society for the Advancement of Chicanos and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS) Job Board
- HigherEd Jobs
- Science Careers
- Society for Developmental Biology
- The Arabidopsis Information Resource
- MaizeGDB
- International Zebrafish society
- jobRxiv
- Several faculty advertised on LinkedIn and Twitter

2) We solicited the names of lab heads who might know of diverse candidates in the fields of interest and sent 130 personal emails to those lab heads. Many of those contacted replied, posted on social media, etc.

3) We scoured the following lists (that recognize underrepresented and underserved scientists) for potential candidates. We then researched the most up-to-date information for each candidate (e.g., PubMed and BioRxiv searches, internet searches to find out whether they already obtained a position) to identify the candidates most likely to be "on the market" and performing research relevant to our searches. We sent 78 individual invitations to apply

- [HHMI Hanna Gray Fellows](#) (2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2022)
- [Leading Edge Fellows](#) (2020, 2021, 2022)
- [Burroughs Wellcome Fund Postdoctoral Diversity Enrichment Program](#) (2020, 2021, 2022)
- NIH K99 MOSAIC Awardees
- [Society for Developmental Biology Ethel Browne Postdoctoral Seminar Series](#) (2020-21, 2021-22)
- SACNAS, AISES, and AWIS resume databases (this avenue was less fruitful; most CVs were out of date, and the database search functions were not optimized)

#### **Outcomes**

We have a large pool of candidates (274) indicating that our widespread advertisement was effective. Targeted approaches were successful in that 22 (28%) of those targeted in strategy three above did apply to the search. Strategy 3 is also the basis for a long-term approach to broadening pools; at least a dozen of those contacted expressed interest in applying in future years when they would be on the job market, and another reached out to express their delight at seeing that OSU was selected as an HHMI Driving Change award site. Additionally, we invited 4 "outside" postdoctoral fellows, who had responded that they plan to be on the job market next year, to give seminars in October and early November 2022. All 4 are women, 3 are URM. An OSU postdoc, who is also a URM, also presented in the series. However, some responses reflected ongoing challenges, for example one postdoc we invited to apply said that she was not applying to any states that had 'trigger' laws.



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

**Yes, this was discussed throughout the process and at every committee meeting. Both the search chair and diversity advocate brought up the importance of holistic review, including evaluation of the diversity statement, when candidates were discussed. The diversity statement was used as a major criterion, along with the teaching statement and other criteria (research accomplishments, proposed research, funding), at every stage of the review process. We finalized our invitation list after evaluating all criteria of each applicant and considering barriers to traditional definitions of excellence that have inequitable effects on some groups of candidates. These discussions led the committee to consider candidates who provide excellence beyond the traditional areas of research.**

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

**The search committee developed a rubric that assessed excellence in teaching and research, as well as past and future contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in our department at OSU. Specific to DEI, candidates were assessed on both their "Knowledge of and track record in Diversity, Equity, Inclusion" and their "Plans for Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion". These were rated from 1(low) to 5 (high) using the following descriptors in the assessment process:**

**A) Knowledge of and track record in Diversity, Equity, Inclusion**

*1-2 Little to no evidence of awareness of DEI issues describes few or no past efforts in any detail*

- Discusses diversity in vague terms, (e.g., "diversity is important for science") or may discount the importance of diversity
- Discusses no or limited specific activities, or only activities that are already expected of faculty as evidence of commitment and involvement (e.g., "I welcome students from all backgrounds" or "I have mentored several women")

*3 Some evidence of awareness and past efforts but not extensive enough to merit a higher score*

- Discusses diversity, equity, and inclusion with some awareness of its importance and some understanding of challenges faced by individuals who are underrepresented or underserved
- Limited participation at the periphery in several DEI-related activities
- In describing mentoring of underrepresented students, gives some detail about specific strategies for effective mentoring, or awareness of the barriers underrepresented students face and how to incorporate the ideas into the mentoring

*4-5 Clear and deep understanding of dimensions of DEI sustained track record of varied efforts to promote DEI in teaching research or service*

- Clear knowledge of and interest in dimensions of diversity that result from different identities, (ethnic, socioeconomic, racial, gender, sexual orientation, disability). This understanding may result from personal experiences as well as an investment in learning about the experiences of those with identities different from the own.
- Discusses the underrepresentation of particular groups and the consequences for higher education or for the discipline.
- Describes multiple activities in depth spanning multiple years, with detailed information about both the role in the activities and the outcomes.

**B) Plans for Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**

*1-2 No personal plans to advance DEI*

- Vague or no statements about what they would do if hired, or may suggest doing so would be the responsibility of someone else
- Describes future activities that are already the minimum expectation of OSU faculty (e.g., being willing to supervise students of any gender or ethnicity)
- Explicitly states the intention to ignore the varying backgrounds of the students and "treat everyone the same."

*3 Some ideas about advancing DEI but not much detail*

- Mentions plans or ideas but more is expected for the career stage. Plans or ideas are lacking in detail or unclear purpose (for example, if "outreach" is proposed, who is the specific target, what is the type of engagement, and what are the expected outcomes? What are the specific roles and responsibilities of the faculty member?)

*4-5 Clear and detailed plans for advancing DEI*

- Identifies existing OSU or national programs they would get involved with.
- Clearly formulates new ideas for advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion through the research, teaching, and/or service, with specific information of the targets and planned outcomes.
- Convincingly expresses intention, with examples, to be a strong advocate for diversity, equity, inclusion, and being ongoing with in the department/school/college and as a scholar/leader.

- 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 EEO report is attached. We had 274 applicants with at least (based on reported numbers):

- 100 (36.5%) female
- 15 (5.5%) Hispanic or Latino
- 3 (1.09%) American Indian or Alaskan Native

We had hoped for a more diverse pool. Except for women and Black/ African American, the number of applicants in the total pool is likely representative based upon data from the NSF survey of earned doctorates in 2016, the NSF survey of postdoctoral scientists in 2020, and IPEDs data on earned PhDs from 2013-2019 in fields relevant to this search (see tables below). NSF data for postdoctoral appointments in Biology and Biomedical sciences data indicates that 55% of postdocs in 2020 hold a temporary visa. It is impossible to determine this status from our EEO numbers, but we assume that at least a fraction of the 50% of applicants who identify as Asian fall into this group.

Based upon these estimates, women, and Black/African American applicants are likely under-represented in the total applicant pool. We are pleased that female and URM candidates did rise to the top; 6 women, 2 applicants who self-identified as Hispanic, and 3 candidates who self-identified as members of the LGBTQ community were selected for our final list of 10 candidates to interview.

**NSF Survey of earned Doctorates 2016 (midpoint in PhD award date for our pool) and 2020 Postdoctoral demographics**

	Earned PhD in Biological and Biomedical Sciences in 2016	Earned PhD in Anatomy/ Developmental Biology in 2016	Earned PhD in Cell/ Cellular Biology/ Histology in 2016	Earned PhD in Genetics-human/ animal, plant genetics in 2016	Postdoctoral appointments in biology and biomedical sciences (2020 survey)	Our search pool	Our pool is:
Female	53%	54%	54%	57%	45.3%	36.5%	under-represented
Black/ African American	3%	1%	1.5%	1.7%	1.4%	0%	under-represented
Hispanic	5.5%	8%	5%	5%	3.5%	5.5%	representative
Native American	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	0.1%	1.09%	representative
White	49%	48%	40%	51%	26.2%	42.8%	representative

**IPEDs data 2013-2019**

	Earned PhD in Molecular Genetics 2013-2019	Earned PhD in Developmental Biology and Embryology 2013-2019	Earned PhD in Cell Biology and Anatomy 2013-2019	Our search pool	Notes
Black/ African American	2%	1%	2.8%	0%	under-represented
Hispanic	6%	5%	3.5%	5.5%	key representative
Native American	0	0.5%	0.7%	1.09%	representative
White	46%	47%	48%	42.8%	representative

- ✓ **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
9/15/22	69	21%	11.5%
9/22/22	100	23%	9%
9/29/22	161	25%	6%
10/02/22	260	36%	6.5%

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

The search committee employed a holistic process, considering research accomplishments and plans, plans for future research funding, experience and interest in teaching, potential to increase equity and inclusion in the department, and alignment with the stated search goals of hiring an outstanding cell/developmental biologist and/ or research in molecular epigenetics.

A rubric was used by all reviewers rating the following items from 1(low) to 5 (high). Descriptors for each score are available on request.

- *Prior evidence of research productivity, creativity, and excellence*
- *Future potential for research productivity, creativity, and excellence*
- *Evidence of and/or potential for research funding*
- *Prior evidence of and/or future potential for teaching excellence*
- *Meets departmental research priorities and teaching needs*
- *Knowledge of and track record in Diversity, Equity, Inclusion*
- *Plans for Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion*

The reviewers also indicated whether the research area for each candidate was appropriate for the search goals of hiring an outstanding cell/developmental biologist and/ or research in molecular epigenetics and provided a holistic yes/no recommendation regarding whether the candidate should be reviewed further.

All applicants were reviewed by at least three search committee members, after which the ratings were shared with the committee. 31 applicants who received three "consider further" votes were advanced to the "long list" and any search committee member was encouraged to advance any candidate they reviewed regardless of "do not consider" votes from other committee members. Additional candidates were added to the long list via reviewer recommendations. This resulted in a long list of 44 candidates, which included 24 (54%) who self-identified as female and 5 (11%) who self-identified as Hispanic. All committee members then reviewed and re-ranked the long list applicants using a worksheet that re-emphasized the importance of holistic review across all facets of excellence, and which asked the reviewers to bin candidates into quartiles. An in-person meeting was held at which all candidates were discussed, resulting in identification of 3 candidates for definite invitation. In the final round of evaluation, each reviewer identified the seven candidates they would choose to complete the invitation list, leading to a list of 17th candidates for final consideration. In the final round of evaluation, 7 additional finalists were selected for in-depth interviews.

Data provided by Assistant Dean Habashi indicates that this pool of 10 contains:

- 60% female and 40% male candidates, enriching for a group underrepresented in our department
- 20% Hispanic scientists, enriching for a group underrepresented in our department



- 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.

***This section is not applicable for this search, as the trained members of the search committee developed the proposed invitation list, and no candidates beyond the 10 proposed for invitations were reviewed by the full faculty***

Applicant's Name	Evaluation	Candidate submitted diversity statement: Yes/No
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

### 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. from Rockefeller University; Postdoctoral training at University of Utah Research Area: meiotic cell cycle and subcellular heterogeneity	Yes
██████████	Ph.D. from University of Pittsburgh Postdoctoral training at Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center Research Area: Mechanisms of genome reactivation during quiescence exit	Yes
██████████	Ph.D. from Yale Postdoctoral training at NINDS/NIH Research Area: Regulation of neuronal gene expression by DNA methylation and RNA splicing	Yes
██████████	Ph.D. from UCLA Postdoctoral training at University of North Carolina Research Area: principles of chromatin engagement by epigenetic machinery and their contribution to human biology and disease.	Yes
██████████	Ph.D. from Vanderbilt Postdoctoral training at Stanford Research Area: mechanisms of phase separation-mediated synapse formation	Yes
██████████	Ph.D. from University of Rochester Postdoctoral training at University of Rochester Research Area: Epigenetic regulation of developmental cell fate transitions	Yes
██████████	Ph.D. from Purdue University Postdoctoral training at Boston Children's Hospital Research Area: tRNA dysregulation and disease	Yes

██████████	Ph.D. from University of Connecticut Postdoctoral training at University of Pennsylvania Current position NIDDK/NIH Research Area: Metabolic chromosomal pairing	Yes
██████████	Ph.D. from University of Maryland Postdoctoral training at Duke Research Area: Cell identity transitions underlying organ development	Yes
██████████	M.D. from Tecnológico de Monterrey (MD) Postdoctoral training at University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center Research Area: Mechanisms of pulmonary endothelial cell heterogeneity in development and disease	Yes

**Importantly this committee is overseeing a combined search for two faculty in different areas, requiring additional on campus interviews**

- 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?

Name	Description
1. ██████████	This candidate self-identifies as female, a first-generation college graduate, and LGBTQ. She states her research area (pigment cell development) to critically DEI issues, has served on DEI committees, and expresses enthusiasm for continuing this work.
2. ██████████	This candidate self-identifies as female and speaks to her lived experience as a disabled scientist. In her current position she is actively engaged in DEI work and highlights future plans including involvement in SACNAS and ABRCMS, and efforts to promote mental health awareness in the department.
3. ██████████	This candidate self-identifies as female and LGBTQ. In her current position she is engaged in outreach and mentoring, and she highlights future plans to support students from underrepresented backgrounds and to amplify LGBTQ voices through engagement in groups like Out in STEM.
4. ██████████	This candidate self-identifies as male, a person of color, and LGBTQ. His statement speaks to his role in mentoring and support of underserved groups, his position on his local DEI committee and he highlights plans to engage with Out in STEM, mentoring, and outreach.
5. ██████████	This candidate's DEI statement is grounded in DEI research, highlighting the needs that impede the success of people in marginalized groups. His future plans highlight existing OSU efforts (DiscoveryPREP, SROP) and highlights his intentions to provide financial and mentoring support for underserved populations.
6. ██████████	This candidate's statement highlights his lived experience as a first-generation college student from a rural village in China. He highlights his interests in OSU programs including LSAMP and LIWOC, as well as his interests in engaging in existing departmental outreach programs including BOEYES, WestFest, and Upward Bound.
7. ██████████	This candidate self-identifies as a male, Latin American scientist. His DEI statement speaks to his lived experience as a Pew Latin American Fellow, and his experience as a Hispanic scientist during his Ph.D. training. He intends to continue his engagement in outreach, including the Frontiers for Young Minds program.
8. ██████████	This candidate highlights her experiences as a woman in science, as well as her involvement in outreach and mentoring through her Ph.D. and postdoctoral training. In her future plans she outlines her continued involvement in "skype a scientist", and her commitment to broadening participation in science through efforts similar to our newly developed postdoctoral seminar series.

9. [REDACTED]	This candidate self-identifies as female, and her DEI statement speaks to her lived experience as a first generation graduate student who grew up in a rural town. She highlights her outreach efforts in graduate school and her postdoc, and her expectations of engaging in outreach through CAPS, the ABRC, and The Women's Place as a faculty member.
10. [REDACTED]	This candidate self-identifies as a Latino female scientist. She highlights her experiences as a World Health Organization (WHO) intern in medical school, where she facilitated youth engagement for the first ever WHO conference on climate change and health, as well as her experiences mentoring and teaching with underserved populations.

**The committee felt that the Diversity statements of all 10 finalists were honest, thoughtful, and sincere. The candidates are a diverse group and most have been actively engaged in DEI efforts over many years. Any of them would amplify and contribute to diversity initiatives within the department, college, and university. It is difficult to summarize so we have attached the diversity statements of all 10 candidates so you can see for yourself how impressive they are.**