FACULTY SEARCH DIVERSITY RECRUITMENT REPORT 2021-2022

Position Title and Number:	Assistant Professor of Physics – NPAP #19511
Search Committee Chair:	Michael Lisa
Search Committee Diversity Advocate:	Nandini Trivedi
Search Committee Members:	Antonio Boveia, Amy Connolly, Richard Furnstahl, Yuri Kovchegov, Michael Lisa, Nandini Trivedi

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: Associate Dean for Diversity Equity Inclusion Wendy Smooth [redacted]
Subject: Approval Request: Faculty Search Diversity Recruitment Report

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

1. APPLICATIONS AND COMMITTEE TRAINING

- Did the search committee chair and/or members attend the "Searching for Inclusive Excellence" training and/or include a trainer at one of their committee meetings? If not, explain why not.

Yes. All committee members attended this 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 2021-February 2022]:

Hire a junior professor in the field of experimental nuclear physics, with a focus at the Electron Ion Collider (EIC) or the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams (FRIB). This would probably be an assistant professor, but we would consider a young associate professor. A prime issue is the age of the existing nuclear experiment group members, 72 and 55.

The search was open for applications in the interval 10 September – 30 November

- What populations are underrepresented in the department/school?

Women, Hispanics, LBGTQ+, Native Americans, Viet Nam Veterans, African Americans, and (I believe) first-generation college graduates are underrepresented in physics in the U.S. overall, and this is true in our physics department. We have made progress in hiring women and are actively pursuing an excellent opportunity to increase racial diversity.

- 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.

In the years prior to this position being open, the nuclear physics group actively sought promising young female nuclear physicists to visit OSU and give a seminar. There was no job, so this was purely exploratory. Several visited and discussed with each of the nuclear faculty. Once the job posted, Lisa reached out to each of these physicists individually, encouraging them to apply. Four of five did.

Once the job posted, in addition to sending the announcement to our own large networks in the field, Lisa and Kovchegov actively pushed the solicitation to the large distribution lists of the laboratories: Brookhaven National Lab (home to the EIC and RHIC colliders), Thomas Jefferson National Lab (JLab), FRIB and CERN in Europe. In the "big science" nuclear physics relevant to this search, every experimentalist will be reached by these announcements.

In addition, Kovchegov and Lisa also reached out to users group and colleagues to learn of even more diverse candidates. We reached out individually to about 6-7 such candidates, mostly women, some of whom were international applicants.

- Did diversity and inclusion, or broadening participation, or related issues arise in discussions during the search process? If so, describe the nature and outcome of such discussions. Did candidates submit diversity statements? How were the statements evaluated as part of the review process?

- 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.

Based on the EEO Report:

Of the 55 applicants on the report, 16.4% were women, statistically consistent of the 19.8% of women receiving PhDs in physics nationally (https://www.aps.org/programs/education/statistics/urm.cfm). Three applicants (5.5%) were Hispanic, statistically consistent with the 4.8% of PhDs awarded to Hispanic students nationally. One candidate (1.8%) identified as Black (and other designations), consistent with the 1.8% of PhDs awarded to Black students nationally.

Are we satisfied with the diversity of the pool? There are two answers. No, in that the available pool of applicants nationally is not sufficiently diverse, as we understand. Yes, in that our outreach efforts have reached a representative cross-section of the community of PhDs, not only "those who look like us."

Based on the more limited information that we had available to us.

As part of our effort to be mindful of DEI issues, we did keep tabs on the URM status of candidates whom we were considering. Naturally, we could only use information available to us, as we did not have the EEO Report. Our definition of diversity was more inclusive than the categories on the EEO Report, including (self-reported) members of the LBGTQ+ community, first-generation college applicants, and Appalachian candidates.

As described below, in our first round, 16 candidates were removed from consideration because they were not nuclear physicists. There were condensed matter physicists, fluid scientists, DNA biologists, theorists, teachers (not involved in research), etc. We did not collect gender/ethnicity statistics on these candidates

Thirty-nine nuclear physicists applied for the position, 11 of whom (28%) we could identify as from URGs. Following the process described below, we generated a Very Long List of 20 applicants, 7 of whom (35%) we could identify as from URGs. From this list, we generated a Long List of 11 applicants, 4 of whom (36%) we could identify as from URGs. From this list, we generated a Short List of 5 applicants, 2 of whom (40%) we could identify as from URGs. On our short list, both are women.

According the American Physical Society (https://www.aps.org/programs/education/statistics/urm.cfm), about 7% of physics PhDs are awarded to racial or ethnic minorities (of all genders). Just under 20% of physics PhDs are awarded to women (of all races and ethnic groups). We believe our initial pool of applicants reflected the community overall. We worked hard to evaluate all applicants—in particular those from URGs—as wholistically as possible. We are happy that two women are among the five excellent candidates that we wish to interview.

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

EEO Report, as of 4 Feb 2022, attached.

2. SCREENING PROCESS

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

Here is the process we used

- In anticipation of this search, the three committee members who are nuclear physicists (Furnstahl, Kovchegov, and Lisa) reached out to the communities to make sure we would not miss promising young scientists from underrepresented groups. We invited several to give seminars at OSU before COVID brought things down. When the job posted, we aggressively pushed the announcement to all user groups, relevant labs and large collaborations. Lisa and Kovchegov further reached out to individual women, to encourage them to apply; most did.
- At the close of the application deadline (30 Nov), there were 55 applicants. The three nuclear physicists made a quick first pass, eliminating those who were not active in the field of nuclear physics. After this pass, 39 candidates remained.

- The three nuclear physicists then spent ten days examining these candidates in detail and meeting. We found it straightforward to identify candidates "clearly below the bar," who would have no conceivable chance to make it to a short list. We decided that it would not be the best use of the committee's time to require all committee members take part in this detailed examination, though all were very welcome to do so, especially those candidates from underrepresented groups (URGs). Here, URG includes women, Hispanics, first-generation college graduates, and members of the LGBTQ+ community.

  In this step, we removed 19 candidates from consideration, four of whom were from URGs. Those that remained constituted our Very Long List (VLL) of 20 candidates, including 7 from URGs.
  Those removed include:
  - [redacted], a female applicant. The decision here was driven by the physics program proposed by the candidate. Nuclear shell model measurements are not of current interest, and the specific research plan was uncompelling. Letters were tepid and record was thin.
  - [redacted], a female candidate. Her record of documented accomplishments was not at the level one would expect for a candidate 8.5 years out from her PhD. This impression is consistent with the letter from her postdoctoral advisor, Prof. [redacted], and her PhD advisor, though both of their letters were positive.
  - [redacted], a Hispanic applicant. All three letters for this candidate were lukewarm, and his research record is very thin. His research statement does not show a compelling direction.
  - [redacted], a Hispanic applicant. The letter from his recent postdoctoral advisor, Prof. [redacted] is lukewarm, and his publication record is slim. His proposed program of research is not compelling. The most interesting part is to take a leading role in constructing part of a new experiment; he has no experience building hardware of any kind, however.
- Starting on 21 December, the entire committee met via zoom for two hours. During this meeting, and in email discussion, we discussed and decided upon the specific rubric by which we would evaluate the 20 candidates on the VLL. We decided to give numerical ratings to each candidate according to seven categories. Importantly, we agreed that the numerical ratings would not bind us, but would rather be a guide to discussions. At that meeting, we also assigned candidates to committee members, such that at least three committee members read and evaluated each candidate. Each candidate was evaluated by: Lisa + [Kovchegov or Furnstahl] + [Connolly or Boveia or Trivedi].
- The entire committee met via zoom for two hours on each of three days (1/7, 1/10, 1/12) to discuss the evaluations. Overall, the level of consistency between different committee members' evaluations of the candidates—and indeed for the categories *within* each candidate's packet—was encouraging. Each candidate was discussed individually by the entire committee, resulting in a Long List (LL) of 11 candidates. Remarkably, while we had agreed that the numerical "scores" for the candidates would be a guide to discussion only, the LL candidates were indeed the 11 highest-scoring on our list. Of the 11 LL candidates, four were URG members. Of the 9 VLL candidates that did not make the LL, three were URG members. These were:
  - [redacted], a female candidate member of the LBGTQ+ community, as per her personal statement. Thoroughly evaluated by 5 committee members; discussed by all. The main problems here were the quality of her research plan (it was somewhat scattershot and lacked coherent direction), the quality of her letters, and a rather thin research record for a 2016 PhD grad.
  - [redacted], a female candidate. Thoroughly evaluated by four committee members; discussed by all. Dr. [redacted] was extremely reluctant to apply for our position, but Prof. Lisa convinced her that it would be good practice, if nothing else. She had been recommended as someone with a lot of promise at the EIC, but she felt that it was too early for her (PhD May 2020). The committee all felt that Dr. [redacted] is indeed too early in her career to consider for a faculty position. She has too short of a record of accomplishment (understandably!) and has not yet had the opportunity to prove herself.
  - [redacted], a female candidate. Thoroughly evaluated by four committee members; discussed by all. Dr. [redacted] ranked near the bottom of the VLL for her research plan (vague and often unrealistic—proposing to join experiments that are already well underway and short-lived) and research accomplishment record lower than one would hope for, from a 2014 PhD graduate.
- This LL of 11 candidates was delivered to Department Chair Michael Poirier on 1/15, as per our charge.

- The committee had by now thoroughly examined the packets of each candidate on the LL and discussed for many hours. To gain a fuller picture of the candidates, to perhaps pick up on something that may not come through on paper, we decided to invite each candidate for a 20-30 minute zoom chat. Each chat was attended by at least four, and usually five members of the committee, and each was recorded, with the candidate's permission. The committee had decided on a list of 6 "standard questions" that we would ask each candidate. (We distributed the questions among the committee members, to make the conversation a bit more "natural.") Of course, follow-up questions could be asked, depending on the candidate's response. These chats took place the week of 24-28 January. Overall, they were very useful and clarifying.
- At this point, committee members had a reasonable amount of information about each candidate, so each was asked to rank order the candidates, from 1 to 11. "Ties" were permitted. To encourage reflection and independent judgement, the committee members did not discuss among themselves, in the interval between the last of the chats and Monday morning, 31 January. At that point, each had submitted their rankings to Lisa (chair), who then distributed the results to all members. As in the previous step, we agreed that the numerical scores generated by an excel spreadsheet would only be a guide, not a mandate. The final result would come from free discussion.
- There followed some extensive discussion on Teams, in which committee members could (but were not required to) explain their reasons for ranking a candidate at some position. The discussion culminated with a zoom meeting (scheduled for two hours, but requiring only one hour) on Wednesday night, 2 February, of the entire committee. Once again, the level of agreement between different committee members was remarkable. Nevertheless, we had difficulty arriving at a list we could all be happiest with, until we relaxed our initial requirement of generating a Short List (SL) of four candidates, to instead having a SL of five. It is fair to say that all on the committee are happy with this list, and we are excited to introduce these candidates to the faculty.

  While reducing the LL to the SL, we kept five candidates, two of whom are women, and removed six candidates, two of whom were from URGs. These were:
  - [redacted], a male first-generation college graduate. Since he made it this far, there is little to say "against" his application. Committee members ranked him a little lower based largely on his research program, which seemed like something of a "grab bag" of experiments in written form. For some, this impression persisted during the chat discussion.
  - [redacted] a male first-generation college graduate. Again, this was an excellent applicant, but simply not one of the top five. One committee member with particular expertise felt that Randhawa was incorrect on an important point in nuclear structure. The others thought he was very good, but not as exciting at the SL five.

OPTIONAL: Please complete the following table for applicants not chosen for a campus interview using the following format (see instructions on the last section on the next page).

Applicant Name/#	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Key for Tab e
1. Insuff c ent re evant des red academ c qua f cat ons.
2. Insuff c ent re evant tra n ng for estab sh ng a f rst-rate research or creat ve act v ty program.
3. Insuff c ent teach ng exper ence and qua f cat ons.
4. Research proposa s or creat ve act v ty potent a were not compe ng.
5. Future fund ng for research program was unc ear.
6. Research or creat ve act v ty program acked c ear gu dance and d rect on.
7. Unab e to contact to schedu e an nterv ew.
8. W thdrew from cons derat on or dec ned an nterv ew offer
9. Other (enter descr pt on)
10. Other (enter descr pt on)

This information is given, for URG candidates, in more detail in the previous section.

3. PROPOSED INTERVIEW POOL

- Briefly describe the credentials of the candidates that you propose to bring as finalists to campus. How satisfied are you with that pool and with its diversity? Please explain.

In alphabetical order:

1) [redacted] – PhD (2018) Rice University
currently Goldhaber Fellow, Brookhaven National Laboratory
Nuclear Physics A Young Scientist Award; RHIC & AGS Thesis Award runner-up
2) [redacted] – PhD (2019) University of Texas, Austin
currently postdoctoral fellow, Brookhaven National Laboratory
RHIC & AGS Merit Award
3) [redacted] – PhD (2015) Michigan State University
Assoc. Prof. of Physics and Astronomy, Ohio University; Director of Edwards Accelerator Laboratory
DOE Early Career Award
4) [redacted] – PhD (2018) University of Virginia
currently Isgur Fellow, Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility
JSA Fellowship
5) [redacted] – PhD (2018) Ohio University
currently postdoctoral researcher at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
APS Five Sigma Physicist Award

We are very satisfied with this pool—they are outstanding intellectuals and scientists. We also believe we have a very diverse pool. In addition to two female candidates, the statements of the men show real awareness and commitment to DEI issues. We believe that any of these candidates will enhance change at Ohio State.

- Were any of the candidates chosen for campus interviews veterans or a person disclosing a disability?

No.

- For each candidate chosen for a campus interview, briefly describe how the candidate would contribute to the diversity of the department/school. How would each candidate amplify the values of inclusion and excellence? 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?

In alphabetical order:

1) [redacted] awareness of some of the challenges facing URGs in higher education is partly informed through his marriage to an immigrant in Texas in the Age of Trump. In his thoughtful diversity statement, he discusses his history of mentoring women and his commitment to integrating his commitment to diversity into his research.
2) [redacted] writes of the importance of considering a potential student wholistically, including aspects beyond traditional measures such as test scores and grades. His experience as a student who needed to support himself while at university is not shared by all professors at top universities.
3) [redacted] has a history of leading an inclusive, diverse research program. He has mentored students and postdoctoral researchers from India, Nepal, Bangladesh, and Kurdistan. Eight of eighteen of these were women, one is a student who returned to grad school in her 40's, and one was in the McNair Scholars program. He has created a diversity action plan, in his position as chair of the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams Users Organization. This is the main organization for radioactive physics in the U.S., affecting thousands of young physicists.
4) [redacted] is a woman and first-generation college graduate. Her life experience, from a small village in Viet Nam to elite graduate programs in the U.S., to large collaborative experiments in national laboratories, has given her a unique perspective on the issues facing women, immigrants, and ethnic minorities in science. She has mentored and worked with students to help them overcome confusions and misunderstandings of culture and language. She sees herself as an example for STEM women.
5) [redacted] is a woman and first-generation college graduate who has been highly active in DEI activities for many years. At Michigan State, she was on the outreach and diversity committees, giving lectures to young Black women interested in science; she was also an elected member of the Ohio Section of the American Physical Society, where she worked on the Membership and Diversity project to quantify and increase diversity in membership. She is the lead mentor for the Girls Who Code program in Tracy, California.

Proposed Interview Pool Chart. This chart is mandatory but including the specific name is optional.

Total number of candidates selected for campus interviews	Gender of candidates interviewed, if known		Race/Ethnicity, Disability Status, and Veteran's Status of candidates interviewed, if known
	Female	Male	
			American Indian or Alaska Native
	1		Asian
			Black or African American
			Hispanic or Latino(a)
			International Applicant
			Pacific Islander
			Two or More Races
	1	3	White
			Race Not Identified
			All by Disability Status = Yes
			All by Veteran Status = Yes
			Unknown status
	2	3	**TOTAL**

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE OPTIONAL TABLE IN PART 2, SCREENING PROCESS

1. If using the optional table:
   a. For each of the general areas listed in items 1-6 on the key, provide a brief description of the specific key factors used in evaluation that the committee agreed to at the start of the search
   b. Include all candidates who apply.
   c. Fill out the table in real time as decisions are made rather than retrospectively.
   d. Check more than one category for individual candidates if more than one applies
2. If not using the optional table,
   a. Committees should keep another chart or notes for each candidate to explain their evaluation (i.e., be able to "document their work process and evaluation metrics").
   b. Divisional deans may ask for these notes if there are questions about the pool.

EEO Report: Physics, Ohio State University

- **Physics** [NPAP #19511, 2021 09 09-2022 07 28 Ass stant Professor

Applicant Race	Total Appl		American Indian or Alaskan Native		Asian		Black or African American		White		Declined		Other		Multiple Selected		Int'l Appl	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Male	6	83 6 %	1(1)	100%	19(2)	76%	1(1)	100%	26(2)	92 86%	1	50%	2(1)	100%	3	100%	9	81 82%
Female	9	16 36%			6	2 %			2	7 1 %	1	50%					2	18 18%
Total Appl	55	100%	1(1)	1 69%	25(2)	2 37%	1(1)	1 69%	28(2)	7 6%	2	3 39%	2(1)	3 39%	3	5 5%	11	20%

Applicant Ethnicity		Total Appl	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian	Black or African American	White	Declined	Other	Multiple Selected	Int'l Appl
Hispanic or Latino	Ma e	3	1(1)		1(1)	2(1)		1	1	
	Fema e									
	Tota App	3	1(1)		1(1)	2(1)		1	1	
Not Hispanic or Latino	Ma e	1		17(1)		2 (1)	1		1	8
	Fema e	6				2				
	Tota App	7		21(1)		26(1)	1		1	8
Declined	Ma e	2		2(1)				1(1)	1	1
	Fema e	1		1						1
	Tota App	3		3(1)				1(1)	1	2
Unknown	Ma e									
	Fema e	2		1			1			1
	Tota App	2		1			1			1
Total	Ma e	6	1(1)	19(2)	1(1)	26(2)	1	2(1)	3	9
	Fema e	9		6		2	1			2
	Tota App	55	1(1)	25(2)	1(1)	28(2)	2	2(1)	3	11

Applicant Disabilities		Total Appl	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian	Black or African American	White	Declined	her	Multiple Selected	Int'l Appl
Yes	Ma e	1				1				
	Fema e									
	Tota App	1				1				
No	Ma e	5	1(1)	19(2)	1(1)	25(2)	1	2(1)	3	9
	Fema e	8		6		2				2
	Tota App	53	1(1)	25(2)	1(1)	27 2)	1	2(1)	3	11
Declined	Ma e									
	Fema e	1					1			
	Tota App	1					1			
Total	Ma e	6	1(1)	19(2)	1(1)	26(2)	1	2(1)	3	9
	Fema e	9		6		2	1			2
	Tota App	55	1(1)	25(2)	1(1)	28(2)	2	2(1)	3	11

Applicant Veteran		Total Appl	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian	Black or African American	White	Declined	Other	Multiple Selected	Int'l Appl
No	Ma e	3	1(1)	16(2)	1(1)	26(2)	1	2(1)	3	7
	Fema e	9		6		2	1			2
	Tota App	52	1(1)	22(2)	1(1)	28(2)	2	2(1)	3	9
Declined	Ma e	2		2						1
	Fema e									
	Tota App	2		2						1
Unknown	Ma e	1		1						1
	Fema e									
	Tota App	1		1						1
Total	Ma e	6	1(1)	19(2)	1(1)	26(2)	1	(1)	3	9
	Fema e	9		6		2	1			2
	Tota App	55	1(1)	25(2)	1(1)	28(2)	2	2(1)	3	11

*** For the race gender data, the numbers n the parentheses, f any, represent mu t p e se ect ons For examp e, 800(25) means that 800 app cants se ected that race, and among them 25 made mu t p e se ect ons wh ch nc ude that race See the FAQ

*** " nt' App " refers to those app cants w th ma ng addresses n other countr es (and some may be your c t zens), and the r responses are a ready nc uded n the overa summary data