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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The working group on the retention of faculty from historically underrepresented groups surveyed faculty, department chairs, and diversity coordinators from across the university and examined WISELI surveys of worklife and of faculty departures, as well as the COACHE survey of faculty departures, in order to better understand the factors behind poor retention rates of faculty from underrepresented groups. The major factors for faculty from historically underrepresented groups to leave include *lack of recognition for their work; the difficulty of having discussions about bias in the recruitment and retention of faculty; lack of accountability in schools, colleges, and departments to ensure effective retention efforts; lack of mentorship for faculty in general and faculty from underrepresented groups in particular; lack of community and community spaces for underrepresented faculty; failure of majority faculty to recognize their role in the successful retention of historically underrepresented faculty;* and *a challenging environment in Madison and the university (both majority white) for people from underrepresented groups.*

The work group recommends changes in our approach to the retention of underrepresented faculty; its primary seven recommendations, in descending priority order, are:

* Requiring greater accountability in Bascom, in Schools and Colleges, and in units for recruitment and retention efforts;
* A more serious and widespread effort to provide training and support at the unit level on bias in recruitment and retention; to require units to create and sustain long-term diversity hiring and retention plans; and to require units to establish robust equity, inclusion and diversity committees that can hold units accountable to those plans;
* A change in hiring practices that includes greater attention to mentoring, long-term success, and community for faculty from historically underrepresented groups;
* Changes in the criteria for leadership positions, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review that focuses greater attention on diversity work and community-engaged scholarship with an emphasis on better recognizing and rewarding this work;
* Recognizing the work done by faculty from underrepresented groups and their allies in advising, community-engaged scholarship, and diversity/equity work through awards, released time, and compensation
* Redoubling our efforts to create cohesive campus communities for faculty from underrepresented groups, creating spaces for faculty who work on issues related to diversity to have intellectual exchange, and consider making hires in cohorts to create community from the point of hire
* Create stronger and more sustainable relationships with community organizations that could serve as partners for faculty whose work focuses on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

A. Committee Charge

In the Fall of 2019, Provost Sarah Mangelsdorf asked the Vice Provost for Faculty and Staff to lead a working group to make recommendations on how to better retain faculty from groups that are historically underrepresented in their fields and at the UW-Madison. This charge was made to address a number of factors that have become apparent over the last decade at the university. Among them are the lower rate of retention at the point of promotion from assistant to associate professor for faculty who identify as African-American; lower rates of satisfaction among women and minority faculty as reflected in the period survey of faculty worklife conducted by the Women in Sciences and Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI); data available through Harvard University’s Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) that shows that the climate on campus for women and people of color is a factor in their decisions to move to other universities; and the reintroduction of a more robust Target of Opportunity faculty initiative that will lead to a growth in hiring of faculty from historically underrepresented groups but that does not directly address the support such new hires will have across the arc of their careers.

For these reasons it is a particularly good time to better understand the factors that lead to poorer rates of retention among faculty from underrepresented groups at UW-Madison. The group’s work involved surveying the departments and programs that have worked to support retention efforts among faculty both here at the UW-Madison and at other universities, and to make recommendations – based on that research – for changes in our practices and policies in order to better support and retain our colleagues both at the point of hire and across their careers. With the first cohort of faculty hired under the new Target of Opportunity Program coming to campus in the fall of 2019, and with a number of other new faculty hires through the Cluster Hiring Initiative and regularly-authorized hires in the schools and colleges, it is imperative that we have in place evolving organizational structures, along with a culture and climate that not only welcomes these new faculty to the university but supports them throughout their careers in such a way that they are eager to remain at UW-Madison even with other universities vying for their attention.

The charge to the working group (the charge letter is attached to this report as an appendix) is “to survey retention programs and efforts we currently have underway [at the UW-Madison]; research peer universities’ programs aimed at the retention of faculty, particularly those from historically underrepresented groups; and to make recommendations to the campus for new or continuing initiatives aimed at the retention of faculty with a particular focus on those from underrepresented groups,” members of communities of color and other marginalized groups.

Importantly, the structural pressures and climate issues that challenge the campus’ ability to retain faculty of color are congruent with similar challenges facing women, members of the LGBTQ+ community, individuals who do not identify as cisgender, people with disabilities, and other marginalized populations within the University. This task force has focused its work on faculty of color, where data are available that indicate a specific problem. However, we acknowledge that while some of the recommendations may provide tangential support for individuals who have been marginalized along other axes, it leaves much of this broader work unaddressed.

 The members of the working group are Tracy Downs, Professor (CHS) of Urology and Associate Dean in the School of Medicine and Public Health; Eve Fine, Director of Curriculum Development and Implementation, WISELI; Douglass Henderson, Chair and Professor of Engineering Physics; Lori Lopez, Associate Professor of Communication Arts; Gloria Mari-Beffa, Professor of Mathematics and Associate Dean in the College of Letters and Science; Alfonso Morales, Professor of Planning and Landscape Architecture; Linn Posey-Maddox, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies; Patrick Sims, Professor of Theatre and Drama and Deputy Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion; Ahna Skop, Professor of Genetics; Christopher Walker, Associate Professor of Dance; and Tehshik Yoon, Professor of Chemistry. The working group was very ably supported by Tanya Hubanks, Office of the Provost.

B. Background

There are good reasons to be concerned about UW-Madison’s ability to retain faculty from historically underrepresented groups, with evidence to sustain them. The evidence comes from five sources: data collected by APIR on faculty retention rates at the point of promotion from assistant to associate professor; exit surveys conducted in 2006 and 2008 by WISELI; the WISELI surveys of faculty work life conducted most recently in 2016; COACHE’s “Faculty Retention and exit survey conducted among participating institutions (UW-Madison was not among them) in 2016; and research studies on faculty retention.

* APIR data suggests that the six-year tenure rates are nine points lower for minority faculty than for non-minority faculty, and that six-year and nine-year tenure rates for faculty who identify as African-American are substantially lower than for majority faculty. The reasons for the differences are unclear, though one possibility is that minority and especially African-American faculty are leaving prior to the tenure decision at higher rates than non-minority faculty members.
* WISELI’s exit survey study note that among reasons faculty reported for leaving UW-Madison, lack of collegiality, discrimination, pay equity, and lack of recognition for their accomplishments are significant factors. One of the study’s recommendations is for the department and the university to address climate issues, including to “ensure that … [instances of] discrimination are handled appropriately and quickly.”
* The WISELI survey of faculty worklife notes that reasons for dissatisfaction among faculty for their work environment include feelings of exclusion from their units and a sense that their work is not supported adequately, feelings more noted among women and people who report being members of underrepresented groups.
* The COACHE faculty retention and exit survey study notes that among reasons why faculty leave their institutions are discrimination (a factor but not among the top-five factors) and a lack of alignment between the institution’s and the faculty member’s values; the study notes that it’s possible that faculty of color who don’t cite bias as a major contributing factor to leaving “have little optimism that another institution will be more hospitable or have cultures less prone to identity-based discrimination.”
* Several research studies[[1]](#footnote-1), many of them based on interviews and surveys of faculty from multiple institutions across the United States, find the following factors contribute to lack of retention for underrepresented faculty:
	+ Research not valued sufficiently
	+ Constantly need to prove themselves/establish credibility as a scholar
	+ Heavy service burdens
	+ Marginalization, isolation, alienation
	+ Lack of community
	+ Lack of respect
	+ Experiences with bias and discrimination

The results from these five sources are consistent with anecdotal evidence that members of the working group heard during its interactions with focus groups and with members’ own experience. The anecdotal evidence includes the sense that women and those from other historically underrepresented or marginalized groups suffer from a lack of appreciation not only for the work in which they engage on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion but also for their academic work; the appearance of bias in search committees’ selection of candidates for faculty positions; the difficulty of living and working in a majority white university and a majority white city that has alarming racial disparities in multiple areas of well-being, including public education (particularly for Black students and families)[[2]](#footnote-2), and the fact that faculty from historically underrepresented groups are tasked with inordinate amounts of service work that result from attempts to diversify shared governance committees and are the go-to mentors and advisors for students from historically underrepresented groups (a kind of ‘double-duty’ in service obligations).

C. Process

The working group took four approaches to gathering information about the factors that led to faculty from underrepresented groups to consider leaving UW-Madison and the barriers to full inclusion they have experienced, and to understand the initiatives already in place here at UW-Madison and at peer institutions designed to bolster the retention of faculty. The first was having conversations within the work group itself about their experiences, as most members of the group are part of historically underrepresented or marginalized groups on campus; the second was to meet with focus groups of faculty who identify as members of historically underrepresented or marginalized groups; the third was to survey department chair and diversity coordinators across the university; and the fourth was to survey programs and initiatives elsewhere.

1. At one of the first meetings of the working group, we used our own members as a focus group and discussed our own experiences at UW-Madison as faculty of color and members of other historically underrepresented or marginalized groups. Personal stories from group members helped to develop a baseline understanding of the issues we were addressing, and also helped to workshop and improve the set of questions we had prepared to use when speaking to other faculty.
2. We then expanded beyond our group to collect information from other faculty across campus. This was not as much an effort to collect widespread data on the reasons why underrepresented faculty leave or stay in Madison, but rather a way to learn details and personal experiences that would allow us to appreciate and think more deeply about some of those reasons. With this purpose the committee held two different sessions with members of the underrepresented community from across the campus and its divisions and asked them to share their experiences and insights about campus climate, polices and practices, and potential reasons for the attrition of faculty from underrepresented groups.

The committee asked a few questions to the groups: about why they have stayed in Madison; about why they would consider leaving; about what campus initiatives to retain faculty they think are effective, and which ones are not. Still, we allotted most time to bringing issues that the group thought to be important and to discussing them in detail. What we learned is that their experiences aligned with those we had heard and read about elsewhere, but we also learned what they felt were the most difficult situations for faculty of color and from other marginalized or underrepresented groups on campus, and how deeply the actions of Chairs and mentors affect them. A summary of the discussions is incorporated in the sections “Experiences of underrepresented Faculty” below.

1. In addition, surveys of chairs and diversity coordinators were undertaken by the DDEEA. The survey was broken down into three categories: recruitment, retention, and defining success in efforts to retain faculty.

Recruitment

The vast majority of respondents to questions about their current efforts to recruit

faculty from historically underrepresented minorities reported making use of programs

already available: WISELI workshops for search committee members, applying in this

past year for permission to hire under the Target of Opportunity program; a few

reported reaching out through networks to identify faculty from underrepresented

groups to increase the breadth and richness of the pool; a few also reported having

diversity committees, and a small handful rewrote their mission and vision statements

to more clearly highlight inclusion. Noteworthy efforts entailed creating a cluster hiring

initiative at the departmental level for one unit, while another actively pursued qualified

applicants from diverse backgrounds that yielded 62% of hires over the last two years.

The most consistent barriers to recruitment were lack of funding for faculty positions generally, lack of a ‘pipeline’ of scholars from historically underrepresented groups, uncompetitive salaries, departmental cultures dominated by an ‘old guard,’ lack of diversity in the city of Madison (including racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity, among others), and a lack of critical mass of people from underrepresented groups in units which could in turn attract a more diverse group of faculty. Among the ways identified by units to expand efforts to recruit more faculty from underrepresented groups were – almost uniformly – make more aggressive use of the TOP program, a greater effort to reach out to colleagues to cultivate relationships with emerging scholars, develop post-doc programs or seminar series (such as Yale’s Synapses seminar series and the Hutch Postdoc Seminar Series) for scholars from historically underrepresented groups, and develop support programs for newly-hired faculty to enhance career development.

Retention

What units reported about efforts to retain faculty from underrepresented groups was inconsistent at best and relatively uninformed, suggesting that units have not had a chance to think critically about these issues and suggesting a need for a set of common best practices and a more comprehensive understanding of existing efforts in department and college committees across campus. Some units touted enhanced commitments to mentoring and fostering intentional discussions about racism and departmental climate. When possible, units that had the capacity expanded bridge-funding and made concerted efforts to proactively raise salaries and nominate faculty from underrepresented groups for research or teaching awards. These instances were more often the exception than the norm, and most units candidly acknowledged they were “not [doing] enough,” or their efforts to retain faculty from underrepresented groups are the same as they are for everyone else. Among barriers to retention, those consistently noted were lack of resources, lack of community, failure to include underrepresented minority faculty on tenure committees, departmental culture/community, and surprisingly, a too-rigorous tenure process. It should be noted that a significant fraction of units reported that they did not see barriers to retaining faculty from underrepresented groups as being within their control, such as a lack of diversity in Madison and meaningful social experiences that enhance quality of life. When asked for concrete ways to expand efforts to retain faculty from underrepresented groups, most units did not respond. Some units didn’t see a need to expand opportunities because they felt their current efforts were successful; those that did included efforts to increase compensation, enhance unit climate and departmental culture, develop mentoring support, and create opportunities for community building.

Defining Success

Almost uniformly, when asked about what the successful recruitment and retention of faculty from underrepresented groups would look like, units reported by numbers: success would be demonstrated by a larger number of faculty from underrepresented groups being hired and choosing to stay where they feel welcomed and included. A smaller subset – about half – noted that success would mean that the culture of the unit would change as a result of better retention and that faculty from underrepresented groups actually thrived in their respective environments. Units would be more inclusive, the research and teaching would be richer and stronger, and the units would attract a more diverse and therefore more intellectually lively student body. Additionally, success was also defined as having a pipeline of diverse faculty who are capable and willing to step in as future leaders within units, thereby shedding the stigmas of some units that have historically presented as a homogeneous group of individuals. When asked what the campus or university could do to assist departments to better recruit and retain faculty from historically underrepresented groups, the following were noted most consistently: maintain and enhance the Target of Opportunity initiative and add a post-doctoral fellowship/seminar series component, create additional programs to support more faculty (such as SMPH’s Centennial Scholars program), recognize that it may be necessary to pay a premium in compensation for the recruitment and retention of faculty from underrepresented groups (or create a separate compensation pool, in addition to the faculty block grant, for faculty from underrepresented groups), provide release time for faculty from underrepresented groups who devote significant time to mentoring students and faculty whose service obligations are overloaded, encourage departments to configure their searches more broadly to attract a broader and richer pool of candidates, make dedication to diversity, equity, and inclusion a criterion on tenure decisions (including at the Divisional Committee level), and insisting on accountability for individuals/chairs/departments that exhibit problematic behaviors that are detrimental to the values of inclusion and units who fail to be proactive in the area of recruiting and retaining faculty from underrepresented groups.

1. Finally, we surveyed initiatives at other universities designed to bolster the retention of faculty, particularly those from historically underrepresented groups. This survey involved visiting the websites of several schools belonging to the Big Ten Academic Alliance and/or schools with NSF ADVANCE Institutional Transformation grants and conducting a search for the following terms from each institution’s home page:
	1. Retention
	2. Faculty retention
	3. Faculty of color
	4. Women faculty
	5. Diversity

In an effort to further explore strategies these institutions are using to improve retention of underrepresented faculty, we also examined initiatives and resources listed on webpages provided by each institution’s Office of Institutional Diversity, Office of the Provost/Chief Academic Officer, and if relevant, the ADVANCE program.

D. Overview of the data collected

The work group found patterns that were not altogether surprising, given the dynamics of retention we’ve experienced on campus over the last decade and a half.

1. Peer institutions

The review of what other institutions are doing focused on initiatives and resources other than those UW-Madison is already pursuing or providing (see Appendix “Retention efforts at UW-Madison”). As at UW-Madison, many institutions are providing incentives and initiatives aimed at increasing the diversity of faculty hired, provide small grants for projects that aim to increase diversity and inclusion, and hold institutional memberships in the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD) thus enabling individual faculty members to take advantage of the online mentoring and resources it provides.

Other institutions appear to offer more resources for faculty development and mentoring that are specific to underrepresented faculty and more opportunities for networking. For example, while UW-Madison has a robust and well-regarded mentoring program for women faculty and the School of Medicine and Public Health provides mentoring and professional development for faculty of color through its Centennial Scholar’s Program, no campus-wide formal mentoring program exists for faculty of color. Several schools/colleges at the University of Michigan, for example, provide “launch committees” – essentially a team of mentors – who meet with new junior faculty once a month during their first year to discuss and address topics relevant to the new faculty members success. The committee includes the department chair, a senior faculty member from within the department with related interests, a senior faculty member from outside the department with related interests, a senior faculty member with expertise/experience in areas of diversity and inclusion who moderates the meeting.

Several other institutions go beyond providing institutional membership in the NCFDD and support the enrollment of faculty of color in the NCFDD’s Faculty Success Program. For example, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign provides $2000 towards the cost of the Faculty Success Program for up to 8 faculty members (5 pre-tenure, 3 tenured) with the expectation that they will share what they learned with others on campus within a year of their participation.

Some institutions provide leadership training, including a focus on diversity and inclusion, for department heads/chairs and administrative leaders. The University of Iowa, for example, provides funding to send its Provost and a group of faculty to the University of Minnesota’s “Keeping our Faculties Symposium,” a conference held once every two years. It also provides a Leadership Development Program for department chairs that includes six cohort-based seminars, self-guided learning, and confidential one-on-one coaching.

Several other schools and colleges rely on networks/affinity groups that provide a source of community and formal/informal networks. The University of Michigan, for example, supports a Women of Color in the Academy Project, a campus-wide faculty network that hosts writing retreats and weekly writing sessions and provides networking and professional development opportunities. Several schools provide support or partial support for faculty women of color to attend the “Faculty Women of Color in the Academy National Conference” (e.g., University of Illinois; Ohio State University). As demonstrated in the Appendix: “Retention Efforts at UW-Madison,” networks and affinity groups are virtually non-existent (new efforts to this effect have just begun in spring 2019) – but information about them is not readily available.

Several institutions provide small grants that fund research that address issues related to diversity and inclusion and/or programs aimed at improving diversity and inclusion in the university and its departments (e.g., University of Minnesota; University of Iowa) – as does UW-Madison. Notably, the grant programs offered at the University of Iowa are funded in part by a $150,000/year contribution from the University of Iowa Athletic Department for a trial period of 3 years – this contribution is based on the Athletic Department’s commitment to improving the climate for its student athletes of color by increasing faculty diversity.

The review of strategies other universities are pursuing to improve faculty retention, especially retention of faculty who belong to groups underrepresented in the academy, suggests that UW-Madison is pursuing many of the same strategies, if not more, but that it can rely on some of the programs others are pursuing to enhance its efforts – particularly in the areas of mentoring, leadership development, and networking.

1. The survey of department chairs and diversity coordinators revealed that many of our units believe they are relatively successful in recruiting and retaining faculty from underrepresented groups, and they’d have more success if they had more funding or were authorized to hire by their schools/colleges; some reported that the current efforts underway – the TOP program, the cluster hiring initiative, WISELI’s workshops on implicit bias and searches – should be continued and in so doing will be sufficient to better recruit and retain. When examining the faculty composition data over the last decade, the static number of some faculty groups that have been historically underrepresented suggest additional resources are not the only answer.

Among those who reported that more would need to be done, some believe that the onus is on the campus: enhance the TOP program, provide better compensation, authorize more searches, more campus awards and recognition for faculty from underrepresented groups. Others were willing to recognize that the barriers to success lay in their own units: a pervasive culture of business-as-usual, a need to change the way searches and review of probationary and tenured faculty were conducted, the need to change the culture and climate of inclusion and equity in the units. Left unclear was what, in the former cases, would be necessary to help shift the onus onto the units and how, in the latter cases, those shifts in the units themselves would be measured (and who would hold the units accountable and in what ways).

The survey revealed, in general, that most units know that recruiting and retaining faculty from historically underrepresented groups is an issue worth addressing, that there are resources available from campus to help, and some are making efforts – by making aggressive use of the TOP initiative, recognizing the accomplishments of faculty from underrepresented groups, forming diversity and climate committees to address the cultures of the units that make retention harder – to do so. Many others, however, need support from campus, and want – or in cases where they don’t want it, need – to be held accountable, and are looking for leadership from their schools, colleges, and central administration. It’s interesting to note that departments report using the named initiatives to recruit underrepresented faculty more than for retaining them, while at the same time they report that they have been more successful retaining than recruiting faculty of color. It is entirely conceivable that units are not as successful at retaining as currently articulated depending on when and under what contexts retention is assessed. This mismatch suggests that there is a disconnect or a lack of understanding to the extent units are feeling like they are successful in retention; it may be in spite of, rather than because of, their efforts in making use of existing campus resources and warrants further exploration.

Our focus groups were designed to collect narrative, personal and anecdotal information that the committee felt was important to assess the reasons why underrepresented faculty leave or stay in Madison, by learning details and personal experiences that would allow us to appreciate and think more deeply about some of those reasons. With this purpose the committee held two different sessions with members of the underrepresented community on campus and asked them.

The committee asked a few questions to the groups: reasons why they have stayed in Madison; why they would consider leaving; what campus initiatives to retain faculty they think are effective; and which ones are not. Still, we allotted most time to bringing issues that the group thought to be important and to discussing them in detail. What we learned is that their experiences aligned with those we had heard and read about elsewhere, but we also learned what they felt were the most difficult situations for faculty of color on campus, and how deeply the actions of Chairs and mentors affect them. A summary of the discussions is incorporated in the sections “Experiences of underrepresented Faculty” below.

When we asked about the experiences that have made their stay in Madison most difficult, focus groups, surveys and reports elsewhere point at a similar list of main offenders:

1. *Lack of recognition for work in the areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion*. Many faculty from underrepresented groups are acutely aware of their potential role model position, and want to be able to work on outreach. They frequently experience a very large service load, both because of their desire to help, and because they are asked to represent their group and bring their experiences to multiple committees. Still, this work is not rewarded or even recognized, so they simply need to add it to their very long list of duties, in some cases damaging their tenure prospects. While campus gives teaching release and other support to those performing tasks that are considered valuable (directing graduate programs or research centers, for example), nothing is done for those doing work on diversity and inclusion. The inescapable conclusion is that this work is not considered to be important or valued at the institutional or departmental level.
2. *Discussions about diversity and of conscious or unconscious biases are difficult to have in units where faculty and chairs aren’t equipped to have them*, which usually are the units that need them the most. It seems to be clear that the preparation of Chairs and other senior faculty to identify, grapple with, and address issues of homophobia, sexism, racism, ableism, and other forms of exclusion or marginalization in departments and across campus is critical to improve the situation for faculty from underrepresented groups. Those who have tried to have discussions find themselves isolated and emotionally drained, or simply choose to leave, facing a group that either does not want to discuss the issue, or feel intimidated by it. How to facilitate these discussions in a way that would help retain these faculty on campus was a frequent topic of concern.
3. *Lack of accountability in units, school/colleges, and beyond for effective efforts on recruitment and retention of underrepresented faculty.* While everyone claims to be committed to increasing the diversity of the faculty, there are no consequences for not doing so. The inconsistency at all levels (Campus, Colleges and departments) points to a culture of opportunism, where units seek to recruit and retain faculty of color and other underrepresented faculty whenever new funding can be obtained, while largely dismissing it otherwise. Lack of accountability has been a frequent topic of discussion at work group meetings and found to be one of the most damaging aspects of campus, college, and departmental culture.
4. *Lack of Mentorship*. Lack of effective mentorship is perhaps the most frequent reason we heard for faculty to consider leaving campus. Some feel that their hire might have been part of a half-hearted effort to diversify, with no real commitment to do so or to change departmental norms and culture. As a result, mentors often lack real interest and investment in the success of underrepresented faculty, often offering conflicting and confusing advice. They also often fail to warn them about unwritten rules, and do not offer help dealing with the other issues listed in this section. The result can be a difficult path to tenure, even if achieved.
5. *Lack of community spaces and community more generally*. Some faculty members in the focus groups wished they had some space to meet peers in similar situations and share experiences. This seemed to be particularly beneficial for junior faculty, who are struggling to find a community and a sense of belonging. Although there are campus initiatives to create that community sense, they are usually ad-hoc and lack a permanent space where these meetings can be allowed to happen.
6. *Failure of majority faculty to recognize the role they can and should play in discussions about diversity, equity, and inclusion*. Many majority faculty on campus seem to feel that only those from underrepresented groups can or should work to increase the faculty diversity and discuss the current situation. Data from our focus groups and analysis suggests that those in the majority seem to feel that issues of diversity and equity on campus do not affect them directly, and thus are not a topic they are comfortable talking about or addressing head-on. Many faculty in the majority lack imagination when seeing themselves as advocates or allies of URM students/faculty and diversity and equity, even as they believe themselves to be staunch supporters of those efforts. This creates a dramatic increase in work load for underrepresented faculty, together with a strain on faculty relations when it comes to diversity and equity issues. Faculty of color and other underrepresented faculty need to risk emotional distress in an effort to bring out discussions, often unsuccessfully.
7. *Challenging environment in the Madison community*. Faculty of color often remark that while campus might be relatively inclusive, the Madison community can be very difficult to live in. The community is largely white, creating a sense of isolation and lack of belonging for faculty of color living in Madison. Furthermore, problems with educational inequities in the Madison School district are well documented, creating a sense that their kids need to attend private schools or have numerous supplemental programs if they are to get a quality education. While the School district is well aware of this problem, and trying to address it, the issue persists.

E. Recommendations

What follows here are a set of recommendations for how the campus can more pro-actively engage in practices, from the point of recruiting new faculty through the life and career arc of these faculty during their careers at UW-Madison. They are arranged thematically, and are meant to directly address the dynamics we found in our investigative and analytical work.

In order to implement these changes, the provost should appoint an implementation committee to ‘operationalize’ the recommendations below; the implementation committee should draw on the membership of this working group.

The recommendations are listed in priority order, with those involving accountability being absolutely crucial to the success of our retention efforts. We note which recommendations may require a commitment of additional funding; which would be longer term efforts; which recommendations are new, and which ones are consistent with other recommendations made previously, particularly in the Strategic Diversity Framework and the R.E.E.L. Change initiatives and the Student Campus Climate Survey.

***Recommendation 1 (highest priority): Accountability***

In order to commit to institutional change, it is important to put measures in place to assess how those changes are implemented and what impact they have had. Underrepresented faculty grow weary of hearing about the value of diversity without actually seeing long-term, institutional change, and accountability measures at every level will help to increase transparency around incremental achievements as well as persistent failures. In order to make measurable change, units must collect meaningful data, in addition to data available from APIR, on faculty from underrepresented groups, and to use this data when measuring outcomes.

1. Require schools/colleges to create **long term diversity plans** and **equity reviews,** including accountability measures; recommend stretch goals; tie annual budgeting and funding to the success in meeting goals; insist on accountability from deans. (This recommendation aligns to the REEL Change Initiative 5, recommendation 3.7 from the Diversity Framework, and recommendation 5 from the Campus Climate Survey.)
2. Greater **accountability** by Bascom to ensure diversity and inclusion efforts are successful at the departmental and school/college levels, where resources follow successful efforts (and are withheld in cases where efforts languish)
	1. Greater priority/attention given to fostering diversity and inclusion for candidates for senior administrative positions (e.g.: deans, provost, vice provosts, vice chancellors, etc.)
	2. Greater priority/attention given to evaluating senior administrators on efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.
3. Accountability measures to ensure that units receiving **Target of Opportunity funding**, as well as other campus-wide diversity funding, are following through with planned efforts in retention.
4. Create **a bridge position that links the work of the DDEEA** **and the office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Staff** that is specifically dedicated to facilitating the recruitment and retention of faculty from underrepresented groups; the person in this position would be responsible for guiding the coordination of recruitment and retention efforts in the schools and colleges, departments, and other units, and would be responsible for ensuring accountability to measures put into place in those local units. The person in this position would also coordinate, with a small group, the implementation of these recommendations.

***Recommendation 2 (highest priority): School/College/Department-Level Accountability and Training***

Efforts toward the retention of underrepresented faculty need to happen at all levels, including putting plans in place for each department and unit across campus to demonstrate meaningful engagement with issues of diversity and equity. Efforts should be made to increase the competence of department leadership in identifying and effectively addressing issues of racism, homophobia, sexism, ableism, and other forms of oppression, and to disperse diversity and equity work across the department, rather than relying on underrepresented faculty to shoulder this work on their own.

1. Require deans to offer **diversity and equity training for chairs.** This should include instruction in how to support and sustain discussions about diversity, inclusion, equity and bias in their departments; attach resources (See Diversity Framework Recommendation 3.6, and REEL Change Initiative 10). Such training should be ongoing and consistent, rather than one-time workshops.
2. Conduct **annual chair evaluations** that include criterion that measures chairs’ successes in the area of diversity, inclusion, and climate, and take proactive measures to support successful ones and make changes when necessary; ideally these evaluations are 360-degree evaluations in which chairs are evaluated by their deans and by members of their departments using anonymous surveys.
3. Require departments, schools, colleges, and other units to establish and maintain meaningful **equity and diversity committees** and empower those committees to make change, with accountability measures; committees should include appointees that have experience in EID work as well as allies; workshops and other training should be provided. Appointments should be for longer terms, staggered, to provide for institutional continuity. (It is worth noting that a number of schools and colleges are moving toward identifying diversity officers within their leadership structures. This is a positive step in the right direction to create more accountability and collaboration, such that these key leaders can guide their respective committees to analyze the success of the units’ diversity and retention plans, with reports to deans and the provost). Committees should be equipped and have the capacity to do the analysis required to move departments forward in their diversity efforts generally and their retention efforts more specifically.
4. Require departments to have **long-term diversity and equity plans** – ones that dovetail with and make reference to those created at the college level – that include attention to the mentoring and support of all faculty but in particular faculty from historically underrepresented groups. Require accountability from departments to demonstrably and measurably achieve success in their efforts to support faculty from underrepresented groups; provide/deny resources accordingly. Departments that do not have long-term diversity and equity plans, and/or that do not follow through to execute those plans and show demonstrable results may not receive permission to hire.)

***Recommendation 3 (highest priority): Hiring Practices***

Successful retention begins with the process of recruiting talented underrepresented faculty. This means making sure that all those who engage in hiring understand how to effectively attract diverse applicants, and why it is important to do so.

1. Ensure true **diversity on search committees**, while also striving not to overburden faculty from underrepresented groups. This could include bringing faculty from other units if necessary; or ensure the appointment of a Human Resources or Equal Employment Opportunity person to the committee
2. Require departments to appoint **search committee chairs** who have proven records of taking diversity, equity, and inclusion seriously in ways that does not pace an undue burden on women, disabled, LGBTQ and other underrepresented people
3. Advise units to write **broader PVL’s** for faculty positions to get deeper pools that would allow a broader, more diverse cross section of the field to apply (a “TOP approach”).
4. Consider creating a ‘premium’ on **salaries** for faculty from historically underrepresented groups to allow them to have resources to address the community issues and educational disparities described above, again without placing an undue burden on faculty from underrepresented groups

***Recommendation 4 (very high priority): Promotion and Leadership***

Underrepresented faculty should be robustly supported in their efforts toward securing tenure and other promotions. This includes increasing transparency about what it means to earn tenure, but also responding to the realities that some scholars are systematically disadvantaged in the tenure process. As they are promoted, underrepresented faculty should also be encouraged and supported (e.g. through training and mentoring) to take on leadership roles so that they can play a role in influencing the future of the department, college/unit, and university.

1. Require departments to **revise tenure/promotion criteria** to include and take seriously the work around diversity and equity that faculty from underrepresented groups and their allies do, including mentoring and recruiting URM students; release time (e.g. course buyouts, summer salary, etc.) should be provided to faculty who engage in this work so that there is also time for them to develop their research agenda
2. Create more funding and support for scholars who are hired to engage in **non-traditional/community-based research**, or whose work shifts in that direction, and build support for this work into criteria for tenure and promotion at the departmental level.
3. Revision of **divisional committee guidelines** to seriously include work in the area of diversity, equity and inclusion, ‘non-traditional’ and ‘community engaged’ work
4. Revise **annual review** and **Post-Tenure Review policies** to ensure that diversity, equity and inclusion work by faculty is counted as a criterion for tenure and is meaningfully included in faculty review.
5. Tie faculty **compensation** incentives to demonstrated engagement with diversity and inclusion efforts; demonstrated engagement with inclusive teaching and research practices
6. Provide **leadership training** for underrepresented faculty that helps encourage more participation in leadership, and promotes successful leadership for those that do take on leadership roles

***Recommendation 5 (very high priority): Recognition***

Underrepresented faculty participate in a wide range of activities that are not always recognized or rewarded through the traditional award structure. The amount of time dedicated to diversity and equity service can also take away from time spent on scholarship and teaching, while those for whom diversity is not a central value can earn awards and serve on award-granting committees. Many of these recommendations will require additional both from central campus and from schools and colleges; we expect the investment to be relatively modest in order to produce significant outcomes for the intended recipients.

1. Ensure that departments provide **release time** for faculty who are working in the area of EID, including advising of students and others beyond what is usually expected of faculty members (see Diversity Framework recommendation 3.6)
2. In concert with the above recommendation, create **Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity/service awards** to recognize the work of faculty from underrepresented groups and their allies who do diversity work, mentoring of URM students, with tangible resources/money, release time
3. Ensure that **Vilas, WARF awards** include criteria recognizing work on diversity and equity-related issues: “all applicants must demonstrate engagement with …”
4. Expand **campus-level awards** for scholarship and teaching on diversity and equity-related issues (and ensure that such awards do not disqualify the recipients from eligibility for other awards) as well as for inclusive teaching. (See Diversity Framework Goal 3.1)
5. Create **college-level award and recognition initiatives** for faculty from underrepresented groups and their allies whose work in diversity, equity, and inclusion is outstanding in any area

***Recommendation 6 (very high priority): Campus Community***

Underrepresented faculty are often isolated and alienated within their own units, where there may be few others who share their background. The creation of a robust community for support and fellowship would help faculty to feel like they belong.

1. Create a **‘cohort hiring’ model**, along the lines of the cluster program, to allow units to make hires of more than one person to create a cohort, which could help retention
2. Create more programs and opportunities for faculty from historically underrepresented groups to **gather and form community**; sustain these spaces financially (this initiative is underway through the affinity group gatherings sponsored by DDEEA).
3. Strengthen **mentoring** resources for underrepresented faculty; and create programs to support and sustain allies in this work
4. Establish a white allies cohort in order to mentor faculty to better support URM faculty
5. Return to the idea of a research center such as the **Wisconsin Institute for Diversity** (see strategic diversity framework), and seek institutional funding, donations, grants from NIH/NSF, or other funding to establish it. The center has the potential to serve a vital role in order to create an institutional hub of activity for faculty with research agendas focused on race, gender, ethnicity, and underrepresented identities can work with each other and generate new research and teaching along these lines, and to have the effect of building an engaged group of faculty who will be more likely to stay at UW-Madison in order to engage together in their research.

***Recommendation 7 (high priority): Broader Madison Community***

Beyond our campus community, underrepresented faculty also must make their home in Madison, a city that struggles with issues of racism and other structural inequalities. Although we recognize that the university has limited impact on the larger problems facing our region, it is important to find ways to address the reality that underrepresented faculty have lives beyond their jobs and that successful retention is connected to improving the experience of living in Madison more broadly.

1. Strengthen the work of the **Office of Community Relations** to help faculty from underrepresented groups “plug in” to the community. (See REEL Change Initiative 4)
2. Support more robust efforts by UW-Madison to **partner with community organizations** that impact the quality of life for faculty and staff (Urban League, Centro Hispano, Native American Community of Madison, others)
3. More robust **dual-career programs** to help partners of faculty find a point of entry into the workforce and community with other major employers in the region (CUNA Mutual, American Family Insurance, Epic, others).
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