

Faculty Assembly Ad Hoc Committee on the Pilot Plan

Final Report. Approved February 16, 2021

Table of Contents

1. Main Response (9 pages)
2. Appendix A: Faculty Hiring Practices Survey (4 pages)
3. Appendix B: CCPD Response (2 pages)
4. Appendix C: Computer Science Response (4 pages)
5. Appendix D: American Studies Response (3 pages)

The Faculty Assembly created this Committee to review the draft Faculty Hiring Pilot Plan that the President and Provost shared with the Assembly (but not the individual faculties) in the summer of 2020. The Assembly itself has no responsibility for faculty appointments, tenure or promotion and lacks authority to speak for individual schools on these matters.¹ Instead, William & Mary's five constituent faculties exercise the University's primary responsibility over appointments priorities and educational policy, just as each exercises such responsibility for its respective portion of the curriculum.² Each faculty exercises these responsibilities pursuant to its own Bylaws and Procedures, which no Pilot Plan or other administrative directive can override.³

The Committee itself included one or more representatives from the Faculty of Arts & Sciences, School of Education, Mason School of Business, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, and Law School. The Committee also considered written comments about the Plan from the Faculty of Arts & Sciences' Committee of Chairs and Program Directors, the Department of

¹ See Faculty Assembly Constitution, Art. I, §13 ("The Assembly's jurisdiction shall not supersede the authority of the constituent faculties as provided in their bylaws and approved by the Board of Visitors.").

² The 1967 AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities provides:

"Faculty status and related matters are *primarily a faculty responsibility*; this area includes *appointments*, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The *primary responsibility of the faculty* for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy." (emphases added) See <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>.

³ See William & Mary Faculty Handbook, §II.D (describing and naming "several faculties" of the University); *id.* ("Each of the faculties is presided over by a Dean and governs itself through by-laws adopted by the respective Faculties and approved by the Board of Visitors."). See also e.g. Bylaws of the Faculty of the Law School §6(a) (authorizing Faculty to adopt standing procedures governing the appointments process). No President could declare, for instance, that all faculties must *ignore* considerations of diversity and/or inclusion when conducting a search.

Computer Science, and the American Studies Program. This document includes these responses in an appendix. The Committee also met with Chon Glover, William & Mary's Chief Diversity Officer, whom the Committee believes chaired the "Faculty Hiring Group" created sometime in 2019 or earlier. Finally, the Committee received and considered a report summarizing the results of a survey, conducted by the Arts & Sciences Faculty Affairs Committee, of appointments practices within Arts & Sciences.⁴ The Committee considered these responses and information that Chon provided when formulating this document.

This Committee applauds the thought, time and effort that various administrators invested in developing the proposed Faculty Hiring Pilot Plan before sharing it with the Assembly. Despite the Assembly's lack of authority over appointments priorities, the Committee can report that each Faculty believes that enhancing faculty diversity should be an important consideration in appointments processes. We must always aspire to identify and attract talent from all segments of the population. Results of searches in some units increasingly reflect successful pursuit of this priority, although for other units progress has been more difficult given the realities of their respective hiring pools, for instance.⁵ Indeed the Committee would like to highlight various barriers described in the table below.⁶

⁴ The Committee also met with Peter McHenry, Tang Associate Professor of Economics, who helped design the survey and summarize the results. Rochelle Seitz, Research Professor of Marine Science, also met with the Committee and described efforts to enhance faculty diversity at VIMS.

⁵ One School, for instance, reports that two-thirds of the offers and one-half of the appointments made over the past five years (six counting this year) were to racially diverse candidates.

⁶ The Committee is not aware of any similar analysis of the composition of the pool of potential candidates for the type of positions likely to be open at William & Mary going forward.

PhDs Granted in 2018, by Discipline and Ethnicity⁷

Field	Number of Recipients				Percent of All Degree Recipients		
	Total	African American	Hispanic	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	Asian American
Economics	484	20	35	67	4%	7%	14%
Political Science	543	28	35	39	5%	6%	7%
Sociology	556	57	53	40	10%	10%	7%
Arts & Humanities	4150	205	348	203	5%	8%	5%
Education	4033	584	302	205	14%	7%	5%
Comp. Sci. (CS/CE) ⁸	1787	36	29	96	2.3%	1.8%	5.9%
Mathematics & Statistics	996	25	51	119	3%	5%	12%
Biology	6406	306	499	778	5%	8%	12%
Chemistry	1711	77	106	176	5%	6%	10%
Physics	1047	⁹	54	120	¹⁰	5%	11%
Ocean Sciences	220	0	10	13	0%	5%	6%

Moreover, we want to stress that to be effective any effort to increase faculty diversity must recognize and accommodate the very different challenges faced by each school and even individual units within the schools. Any such effort must also accommodate and support the large variety of

⁷ National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2018 Survey of Earned Doctorates <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf20301/data-tables/>

⁸ In 2018, of the 894 advertised tenured track positions in Computer Science and Computer Engineering in North America (US and Canada), only 767 were filled. Across all types of CS/CE departments, the tenure-track hiring success rate during the three most recent recruiting cycles (2017-2019) has decreased from 82.7 percent to 77.3 percent to 70.4 percent because of competition with industry. The ethnicity of newly hired faculty in 2018 in tenure track positions is broken down as follows: African American 13 (3.7%), Hispanic 7 (2%) and Asian American 117 (33%). Note that these numbers also include faculty already in tenure-track positions who changed jobs (*i.e.*, not just fresh PhDs). Source: Computing Research Association (CRA) Annual Taulbee Survey (<https://cra.org/resources/taulbee-survey/>).

⁹ Sample too small to report without disclosing confidential information.

¹⁰ Sample too small to report without disclosing confidential information.

practices that different units have adopted, presumably in response to the unique challenges and environment each unit faces.¹¹

Nonetheless, the Faculty as a whole, shares the frustration of the Administration at the modest pace of progress. We do want to point out, however, that the composition of any faculty reflects appointments choices made over several decades. Absent a substantial increase in new faculty positions, the composition of any faculty changes slowly and “at the margins.” True success in this endeavor will require a long-term and intentional strategy as well as dedicated resources that will make William & Mary an attractive destination *and home* for diverse faculty candidates to whom William & Mary makes offers. Without this support, William & Mary will not be able to make offers as attractive as those made by other schools or even be able to retain faculty in the face of better compensation elsewhere.

While we want to highlight the problem of noncompetitive salaries and benefits, the Committee has taken the proposed pilot plan as a starting point as we work for the shared goal of improved diversity hiring. We have studied this draft plan with great interest. The Committee has also had the benefits of written comments from two units in Arts & Sciences and the CCPD, which are attached here as an appendix. Some of the plan’s proposals replicate practices already in place in some and/or all units.¹² Others contradict the Bylaws and/or binding Procedures of at least one School and would thus be invalid to that extent. Still others provide useful ideas that the Committee considers worthy of serious consideration by the faculties responsible for setting and implementing appointments priorities.¹³

¹¹ See Summary of Arts & Sciences Faculty Affairs Committee Faculty Hiring Survey, 1 (December 2020) (“Each department of program hires faculty in a distinct labor market with its own timeline and expectations. Hiring units collect applications, interview candidates, deliberate, and make offers in different ways. Those differences are at least partly responses to field-specific norms and constraints.”). Chon Glover recognized the need for flexibility among units and indicated to the Committee that various aspects of the Plan were for that reason negotiable.

¹² Apparently, all units involve students in one or more ways in the appointments process. See e.g. Summary of A&S FAC Faculty Hiring Survey, at 2 (describing different modes of student involvement in search processes). A few always or sometimes include students on search committees. See *id.* All apparently involve students in the interview process and gather student feedback about each candidate. Many include students in candidate workshops and/or require candidates to hold distinct student-centered workshops. Deans may also intentionally appoint or nominate strong advocates of diversity to appointments committees. Some units take implicit bias training and/or require candidates to submit so-called “diversity and inclusion” statements. The Law School, it should be noted, has always started searches earlier than most or all units on campus and has involved a student committee in the interview process for at least 27 years.

¹³ There seemed to be a consensus among those A&S units that have responded in favor of student involvement, beginning searches earlier than is the current practice, defining positions in a transparent and equitable manner, focused and intentional recruitment efforts, and creating transparent benchmarks against which we can measure our progress and hold ourselves accountable. There was also a consensus *against* hiring a talent scout. Nor did the Committee find any support for requiring Faculties or Departments to send a list of three candidates to a Dean, who would then extend an offer to the Dean’s preferred candidate.

The Committee welcomes the Administration's suggestions regarding how to improve the appointments process. We believe, however, that the proposed Pilot Plan is incomplete in several important respects, even for such an ostensibly limited program. The premise of the plan seems to be that there are a not insignificant number of qualified diverse candidates for faculty positions that our current search processes do not identify, with the result that reforming the appointments *process* can meaningfully impact faculty diversity.¹⁴ Moreover, as we see it, some omissions in the plan and gaps in the data it provides make it difficult to assess the proposed pilot's likely impact. More fundamentally, the proposed plan, by focusing solely on the appointments *process* itself, addresses what is at best a lesser issue and ignores more salient obstacles to hiring and maintaining a diverse faculty.

I. Omissions Regarding Proposed Changes to the Search Process

Almost all the units who responded to the Committee's request to review the pilot pointed out that the plan does not define "diversity." Defining such a benchmark is certainly a necessary starting point for any systematic program. Absent a common and transparent understanding of this term it is impossible to define the extent of the University's shortcomings on this score or determine how to overcome them.¹⁵ Nor is it possible to assess the pool or "pipeline" of potential candidates for positions likely to be open at William & Mary or the pool of candidates who in fact apply for open positions.¹⁶ Nor is it possible to measure progress or hold ourselves accountable

The Committee also notes that prohibiting a search committee or Faculty from expressing its preference among finalists would deprive a Dean of valuable information and thus contradict William & Mary's professed commitment to data-driven and evidence-based decision making. The Committee itself believes that some faculty would welcome additional support and advice from Human Resources and/or the Office of Diversity and Inclusion regarding how to identify potential candidates. The utility of such advice and support would likely vary among various units.

¹⁴ It should be noted that the Administration has not provided any empirical support for this claim. For instance, the Administration apparently does not gather information regarding the diversity (however defined) of the pools of candidates from which different Schools select candidates. Nor does the Administration retain data regarding the diversity of candidates who apply for faculty positions at William & Mary. Comparisons between overall faculty diversity and the diversity of the student body are of limited value. The demographic composition of the pipeline of students differs significantly from the composition of the pipeline for candidates for faculty positions. Moreover, a large portion of current faculty were drawn from pools that were significantly less diverse than current pools.

¹⁵ The Committee recognizes that a university-wide definition of diversity might not be possible or advisable. The University's own Statement of Vision, Mission and Values professes that William & Mary embraces "diverse people *and perspectives*." (emphasis added) Chon Glover confirmed for the Committee that the University values numerous forms of diversity, in addition to racial, ethnic and gender diversity. Certainly, different faculty members can, when discharging their duties and exercising their professional academic judgment, entertain and implement different definitions of diversity. For instance, the Law School's 2019 Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion defined "Diversity" to include several dimensions, including racial, economic, ethnic, religious, gender, and ideological categories for instance.

¹⁶ Any such definition must make it possible to determine how diverse we already are, how many diverse candidates for faculty positions are available and what we can do to attract and retain diverse candidates.

for a lack of progress.¹⁷ Note, too, that without such a definition it is difficult to assess the correlation between appointing “inclusive teachers,” a professed objective of the cover memo to the plan, and increasing faculty diversity. Finally, this lack of a definition prevents us from assessing how many diverse faculty members we have appointed and retained over the past years.

Second, the plan does not speak to the *retention* of diverse faculty. The Administration apparently has not maintained data regarding how many diverse faculty members depart from William & Mary or conduct exit interviews of departing faculty.¹⁸ Robust recruitment becomes almost futile if the recruited faculty member departs five years later.¹⁹ If diverse faculty depart at a higher rate than others, the faculty may well become *less* diverse over time. The Committee would need to hear more about how the Administration plans to enhance faculty retention before it can evaluate whether the draft pilot plan is worth the considerable investment of time and resources that the plan contemplates.

Third, the plan’s cover memo focuses on the appointment of *inclusive* (not diverse) teachers. A unit can achieve this objective without appointing a single diverse faculty member.²⁰ The Committee would thus need to hear more from the Administration about the rationale for choosing “inclusive teaching” over “diversity” before it can gauge the potential impact of the plan on faculty diversity.

II. Omissions Regarding Adequate Faculty Compensation, Broadly Defined

Most fundamentally, the proposed plan does not allude to any sustained long-term financial investment in faculty recruitment and retention of the sort necessary to increase *and sustain* faculty diversity in a competitive environment.²¹ Locating and providing such resources is the primary if

¹⁷ Chon Glover reported that the Administration has not conducted any analysis of the pool of potential candidates for the type of positions likely to be open at William & Mary going forward. *See* William & Mary Website, p. 1 (reporting that 63 percent of William & Mary students obtain “majors in STEM and Computational Fields.”) (<https://www.wm.edu/> visited January 24, 2021).

¹⁸ Chon Glover reported to the Assembly in April 2020 that the Administration does not maintain such data or conduct such interviews. Some members of the Assembly suggested that the Administration begin doing so. Chon reported to the Committee in November that she has started to collect such data and conduct such interviews.

¹⁹ One School reports that two thirds (four out of six) of its racially diverse faculty members departed for other schools over a seven-year period (2011-2017). A fifth racially diverse faculty member retired early in this period.

²⁰ The President confirmed to the Assembly that “even straight white males” could qualify, if they correctly answered the question “who in your classroom is underrepresented.” (The correct answer would presumably depend in part upon the definition of diversity.).

²¹ Of course, no “pilot program” can address all methods for achieving an institutional objective. However, the Committee is not aware of any recognition by the Administration that substantial investments are necessary to achieve and maintain such diversity, let alone any commitment to alter our financial model in a way that would make such investments possible.

not exclusive responsibility of the Administration. Each Committee member's own experience, input from others, the survey of Departments and Programs by the Arts & Science Faculty Affairs Committee, and results of faculty surveys establish several shortcomings in the University's financial commitment to faculty recruitment and retention. Each such shortcoming, highlighted below, is a longstanding pre-Covid phenomenon. Each is also a result of William & Mary's financial model and persistent, intentional resource allocation choices the Administration has made, sometimes contrary to priorities expressly articulated by the faculty. Because these shortcomings reflect longstanding and repeated choices not to invest in faculty compensation, broadly defined, only continuous, forward-looking, and determined efforts can produce the sort of change necessary to enhance substantially the diversity of the faculty in a timely fashion.

● **Salaries Offers are Inadequate.** William & Mary is not the only institution seeking diverse faculty candidates. The competition for such candidates is often fierce, with salary playing an important role.²² The 1993 "Into the Fourth Century" strategic plan articulated a goal of increase the diversity of the Faculty. The plan also set a goal of raising faculty salaries to the 75th percentile of our peer group.²³ The Administration reiterated this goal more than a decade later.

In FY 2016, the most recent year for which we could locate data, faculty salaries were at the 43rd percentile of our peer group, well below even the Commonwealth's more modest professed goal of the 60th percentile. To put this in more concrete terms, the average faculty salary was more than \$17,000 below the Commonwealth's target in FY 2016. We surmise that we have lost ground since that time. The Administration froze salaries across the campus in FY 2019.²⁴ The state imposed a three percent "lockstep" raise in FY 2020, unrelated to merit. At least one unit provided raises lower than the BOV

²² Some units must also compete with the private sector. Amazon reportedly hires up to thirty economists each year. Some law firms pay signing bonuses of \$300,000 to former Supreme Court clerks. Entry level salaries in private industry, not including signing bonus, for PhDs in Computer Science often exceed the salaries of senior full professors at William & Mary.

²³ The 1993 plan recognized that robust private giving would play an important role in achieving this objective. Since that time, the University has conceived and completed two campaigns that raised a combined \$1.5 Billion. Despite the hard work of several Presidents and other administrators, members of the Board of Visitors, numerous development officers, staff and faculty, the William and Mary Foundation, and generosity of so many alumni/ae and friends, we seem no closer to achieving competitive salaries than we were in 1993.

²⁴ "[I]n FY19, the university provided no salary increases given its focus on ensuring sufficient need-based aid for Virginia undergraduates." See William & Mary 2019 Six Year Plan, 6 (October 1, 2019). The same six-year plan reports that spending on undergraduate financial aid more than doubled between FY 2013 and FY 2020, from \$19.1 million to \$44.3 million. See *id.* at 4.

authorized in FY 2018. These salary actions were all pre-Covid, when the national and state economies were more robust than the historical average.

Even before Covid, open faculty positions were scarce, despite numerous departures and a growing student body. When a unit *does* search for new faculty, it must put its best foot forward. Given the Administration's allocation of resources to other priorities, William & Mary's salaries are below those of most peers. Moreover, no unit here can make a credible commitment to provide new appointees modest but consistent merit-driven raises.²⁵

- **Salaries are inadequate to retain faculty.** Substandard salaries also make it difficult to retain those faculty, particularly diverse faculty, that the University does appoint.²⁶ Such faculty often find themselves on the short end of salary inversion after they earn tenure. Faculty surveys have found that substandard salaries induce faculty to consider seeking appointments at other institutions.

- **The University lacks a spousal appointment policy.** Many candidates have spouses who desire an academic appointment of some sort. Numerous faculty report that diverse candidates have rejected the University's offer because the University has not offered the candidate's spouse an attractive position.²⁷ Few things are more frustrating to faculty than to spend several months searching for and recruiting a diverse candidate, only to learn that the Administration cannot identify or create an NTE position for the candidate's spouse, for instance. This is an old problem and one that will only magnify in importance going forward, but we know of no meaningful university-wide effort to address it. Here again, the Administration bears the primary if not exclusive responsibility for creating and supporting such a policy.

- **Benefits are substandard.** As faculty reported to the Administration over a decade ago, most of our SCHEV peers, including almost half of our public peers, provide faculty with children a tuition benefit. Such benefits can be worth over \$400,000 (and rising) for a family with two children.²⁸ Candidates regularly ask if William & Mary offers

²⁵ Twenty-Four Departments and Programs responded to the survey of Departments and Programs by the Faculty Affairs Committee of Arts & Sciences. Twenty-Two reported significant barriers to identifying and appointing preferred candidates to tenure track positions. Nearly all of these indicated that "uncompetitive salaries" are such a barrier. (See Summary of A&S FAC Faculty Hiring Survey, at 2) Another school reports that it has lost more than 80 percent of competitions with peer schools for entry level candidates over the past twelve years. This unit only prevailed in two such competitions. In each case the candidate had close ties to both William & Mary and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

²⁶ See Summary of A&S FAC Faculty Hiring Survey, at 1 (reporting that some respondents would spend resources allocated "to increase diversity hiring" to "support retention.").

²⁷ See Summary of A&S FAC Faculty Hiring Survey, at 2 (reporting that respondents commonly identified "lack of partner opportunities" as a barrier to appointing preferred candidates).

²⁸ Some peers that charge tuition over \$50,000 per year provide full tuition remission.

such a benefit, and our regular answer is “no.”²⁹ The absence of such a benefit, while problematic in and of itself, also sends a negative signal about our overall commitment to providing robust compensation to faculty (and staff). Summer salary in those schools that offer such salaries is also substandard.³⁰ Start-up packages are often non-competitive as well.³¹ The Provost has even expressed misgivings about paying those faculty who take a yearlong SSRL 80 percent of their salary, thus signaling a pending *reduction* in benefits.

The Committee knows of no effort or commitment by the Administration to remedy any of these shortcomings, let alone all of them.³² Indeed, the Administration reported to the Assembly in the spring of 2020 that the University’s pre-Covid projected FY 2021 deficit had grown by \$6.4 million compared to that projected just a few months earlier. \$6.4 million is the equivalent of dozens of faculty positions in some units. The Committee is eager to hear the Administration explain how the draft Pilot Plan or even a similar, more permanent plan can succeed absent substantial adjustments to the University’s financial model and concomitant substantial investments in faculty recruitment and retention. Absent such investments, the impact of any such Pilot Plan on faculty diversity will be modest at best and more likely imperceptible.

III. Conclusion

We appreciate the thoughtful efforts of the Administration to craft the Pilot Plan. We believe that Faculty share the overall goals of the Plan, although different faculty might define diversity differently. At the same time, we believe that the focus of the Plan — overhauling search processes around the campus — does not address the main obstacles to achieving and maintaining faculty diversity. To be successful, any such effort must focus primarily on something entirely missing from the current draft plan, namely, improving compensation, broadly defined, that the University provides to its faculty. Any such effort must also recognize the great variety of challenges different units face when seeking to enhance and maintain faculty diversity and reject any “one-sized fits all” approach. Instead of prescribing uniform procedures, the Administration should invest greater resources in supporting the efforts of faculty in individual units as they exercise their “primary responsibilities” to determine and implement appointments priorities.

²⁹ State law allows a Virginia Public University to provide such a benefit so long as the University funds the benefit out of private giving. At least one Virginia professional school does exactly that. The University apparently did not make such funding a priority in the recent “For the Bold” campaign.

³⁰ At the Law School for instance, summer research grants have been frozen for over a decade.

³¹ See Summary of A&S FAC Faculty Hiring Survey, at 2 (reporting that respondents commonly identified “uncompetitive start up funds” as a barrier to appointing preferred candidates).

³² William & Mary’s 2019 Six Year Plan, submitted to the State Council of Higher Education, predicted “an average merit-based increase of 3% for all university staff” for FY 2021 and 2022. See William & Mary 2019 Six Year Plan, 7 (October 1, 2019).

Appendix A: Faculty Hiring Practices Survey (4 pages)

Summary of results from a survey: Faculty Hiring Practices at W&M
Faculty Affairs Committee
December 2020

Abstract

The Faculty Affairs Committee fielded a survey of department chairs and program directors about faculty hiring practices. Responses came in October and November 2020 from 18 departments and 6 programs listed in the Appendix. Here are three themes from the responses:

- 1) Variety. Each department or program hires faculty in a distinct labor market with its own timeline and expectations. Hiring units collect applications, interview candidates, deliberate, and make offers in different ways. Those differences are at least partly responses to field-specific norms and constraints.
- 2) Barriers. Hiring preferred candidates is difficult. Bureaucratic delays make hiring more difficult at William & Mary. Low salaries, small start-up packages, and weak support for spouses' job searches are also common barriers.
- 3) Coordination is difficult to manage when programs and departments attempt a joint hire.

Details about the survey

The survey asked respondents to focus on searches for tenure-eligible assistant professor positions. A couple of questions at the end switched the focus to senior hires. The survey did not focus on the hiring process for non-tenure eligible positions or staff positions. We encouraged all department chairs and program directors to complete the survey, although our messages noted that programs with little hiring history may want to opt out.

Results from the survey

Written policies

Twelve units (half of them) have written policies about their faculty hiring processes. We collected and filed most of those documents.

Diversity

For strategies to ensure the broadest outreach to diversity candidates, the main focus was on advertising. In some fields there are relatively standard outlets used for advertising whereas eight units reached out directly to potential universities or candidates to solicit applications. Another strategy was to work with Chief Diversity Officer Chon Glover in crafting the advertisement ("We work closely with Chon Glover on advertising, and as well tap into all of the networks our faculty are involved in."). One respondent mentioned using the IGNITE program to recruit diverse faculty.

A follow-up survey question asked what programs and departments would implement with additional resources to increase diversity hiring. Responses included sending faculty to conferences that would facilitate outreach to applicants from under-represented groups, more advertising, targeted and cluster hires, and resources to support retention.

Barriers to hiring

There were a wide range of barriers noted during the search process. The most common responses included getting approval from the Human Resources office (Equal Opportunity) and all approvals needed in PeopleAdmin. Additional issues noted in multiple responses included delays in the Dean's Office with offers or counteroffers and getting the line and advertisement approved. Other things noted included, for programs, challenges with the timeline working with a department to get approval, and short lists that were too long. Two responses indicated no significant barriers in the hiring process.

The survey also included a question about barriers to getting the top choice and there was more uniformity in these responses. Nearly every respondent with concerns indicated uncompetitive salaries. Other common responses were uncompetitive start-up funds, lack of partner opportunities, our location in Williamsburg, and the quality and quantity of research space.

Timelines

Twelve units reported that their academic fields have central job search processes or timelines. The table below shows the time-of-year distribution across units of three important activities: beginning phone or off-campus interviews, beginning on-campus interviews, and making first offers. Some respondents gave us a range rather than a single month; we show the beginning of the range.

Count of units beginning each step in the hiring process, by month			
	Begin phone or off-campus interviews	Begin on-campus interviews	Make first offer
September	2		
October	1	1	
November	6	3	4
December	3		2
January	4	8	2
February		2	8
March			4
April			
May			1

NOTE: Numbers sum to fewer than 24 because some units did not answer all questions.

Student involvement

One department always has a student on the search committee, one department usually does, and one department sometimes does. Seventeen other units never do (not all units answered the question).

Here is a quote from one department "The faculty search committee has 4-5 faculty members. There is always also an undergraduate student committee and a separate graduate student committee. Each of these student committees has a lunch meeting with each candidate and writes extensive feedback on each candidate that is an important component of the selection process, but do not vote to select a candidate."

Students are often involved in on-campus candidate visits -- but not always -- and details vary across units. A targeted presentation to students is always on the schedule in 11 units. It is

usually on the schedule in 1, sometimes on the schedule in 5, and never on the schedule in 3 units.

Search committees

Search committee sizes range from 3 to 5 (mode is 3) except that in 3 units the entire department fills the role. The search committee includes the chair or director always in 6 units, usually in 2, sometimes in 6, and never in 7. Assistant professors are allowed to be on the search committee in every unit. It is very common for faculty from outside the search field to serve on the search committee.

Initial interviews

Seventeen units have phone or virtual interviews to narrow the candidate list. Four units do not. Five units have off-campus in-person interviews (i.e., at a conference). The other units do not have off-campus in-person interviews.

On-campus interviews

Candidate visits to campus almost always include a research presentation to faculty. Presentations are always recorded in 2 units, sometimes or usually in 9, and never in 8. All faculty in the unit are encouraged to meet all candidates in almost all units, although schedule conflicts keep some away.

Decision-making

Different groups within units decide which candidates to hire. The first offer is decided by the search committee in 5 units and by the whole unit in 15.

Suggested improvements

The top two suggested improvements are 1) shortening and removing time delays between approvals (of position, advertisement, shortlist, and offers and counter-offers) and 2) increase salaries and, when applicable, start-up packages. Some departments and programs also emphasized the need for earlier approval of the search (ideally May or June), support for more on-campus interviews, and greater support for spousal hires.

Senior hires

Six units have attempted a senior hire in the past 5 years. While many departments and programs expressed concern that salaries and start-up packages at this level would be even less competitive than they are at the Assistant Professor level, many also cited the possible benefits of gaining individuals with valuable research, grantsmanship, teaching, mentoring, and administrative skills who would be able to rebalance unit demographics and attract (when applicable) graduate students. Some senior hires may also help to improve W&M's reputation.

Success rates

Analysis of hiring data makes it clear that W&M in some cases does well with getting the top choice, but there are significant struggles with many searches. We complemented our survey results with an analysis of records from faculty searches in Arts & Sciences. These were almost all at the assistant professor level, but a few searches were for associate and full professor positions.

In 2018-19 (most recent pre-COVID hiring year), there were 15 searches in A&S. In eight searches, the top choice accepted the offer. For four searches, the search was successful, but the top choice was not hired and there were three failed searches. A total of 16 offers were declined. In 2019-2020, excluding one search that was cancelled due to the pandemic, there were 20 searches in A&S. Of these, 10 resulted in the top choice being hired, five resulted in a hire other than the top choice, and five searches failed. A total of 17 offers were declined. Thus, in recent years, W&M appears to get the top choice in approximately 50% of searches. One issue that must be tracked is the troubling finding that 25% of searches failed in 2019-2020.

Two caveats apply here. First, anecdotally we know that some preferred candidates opted out unofficially and hence never received an offer. So the true fraction of searches that yield the top-choice candidate is lower than the estimate above. Second, in order to avoid failed searches departments and programs choose candidates who might plausibly accept an offer. So “top choice” candidates are not necessarily the best candidates for the job: they are the most-preferred candidates among those likely to accept (given W&M’s location, salary, start-up package, etc.).

Appendix

Departments responding to the survey

- Anthropology
- Art and Art History
- Biology
- Classical Studies
- Computer Science
- Economics
- English
- Geology
- History
- Kinesiology & Health Sciences
- Mathematics
- Modern Languages & Literatures
- Music
- Philosophy
- Physics
- Psychological Sciences
- Religious Studies
- Sociology

Programs responding to the survey

- Chinese Studies
- Linguistics
- Marine Science
- Film & Media Studies
- American Studies
- Neuroscience

APPENDIX B: CCPD Response (2 pages)

TO: Maria Donoghue Velleca, Dean, Arts & Sciences, William & Mary
Peggy Agouris, Provost, William & Mary
Katherine Rowe, President, William & Mary
FROM: W&M A&S Committee of Chairs and Program Directors
RE: President's Proposed Enhanced Faculty Hiring Framework
DATE: September 25, 2020

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the President's Proposed Enhanced Faculty Hiring Framework, which we received from Dean Donoghue Velleca on August 21, 2020. This proposed framework has been a topic of robust discussion amongst A&S faculty and their departments and programs, some of which have--or shortly will--send their own comments. Consequently, we will keep this document very short, distilling it to key shared points.

What we like in the proposed framework:

- The aim of fostering diversity in the W&M faculty and of holding ourselves (as individuals; as departments, programs, and schools) and the institution to account as we pursue this aim.
- Involving students in faculty searches.
- The idea of training a cadre of faculty Search Advocates within each school, who will work with search committees to ensure fair and unbiased search processes.
- The idea of planning/starting search processes much earlier, in order to allow both cultivating maximum diversity in applicant pools and scheduling anti-bias training for those involved in searches.
- The idea of carefully conceived, structured, and resourced "cluster hires."
- The plan for increased staffing in the Office of Diversity & Inclusion for support of faculty search processes. Note: We believe that such staffing support would be a much more effective use of resources--at least in relation to faculty hiring in A&S--than a Talent Acquisition Specialist.

Problems we foresee with the proposed framework:

- The lack of any defined (even if broadly defined) sense of what is meant by "diversity" within this plan. In virtually all our fields and across all W&M's schools, we need more African American and BIPOC faculty. Many of our fields also need more women faculty. Some of our fields could benefit from more faculty from outside the U.S.; others have an abundance of faculty from outside the U.S. (who factor in unclear ways in U.S.--and perhaps W&M's--ideas of diversity). Are we also seeking (ideological/political) "viewpoint diversity" with this plan?
- The proposed super-uniformity of practices (which we see as distinct from uniform aims and measures). Different fields have different histories in relation to diversity/inclusion (variously defined and measured) and, thus, confront different "pipeline" challenges. Additionally, there are significant differences across fields in the ways academic markets function (timing of searches, level of non-academic competition, interview norms) and in the experience job-seekers have (particularly with respect to teaching opportunities). Trying to make these fields fit a single model might yield success in some fields but will yield defeat in others, *especially to the extent that such practices slow our search and job-offer processes down.*
- The requirement that "all faculty search committees include (at least) representation from the School undertaking the hire, one Search Advocate, and the Talent Acquisition Specialist." This requirement will either make search committees too large, slowing down the search process, or fail to include the expertise needed to evaluate job applicants. Over the course of a typical year of hiring in

Arts & Sciences alone, it seems impossible for a single individual (the Talent Acquisition Specialist) to serve on every faculty search committee.

- The idea of sending an unranked list of candidates for Deans to select from. Such a practice is antithetical to the several careful search-crafting and training practices called for in the framework. Such a practice certainly would not “empower those who participate in the faculty hiring process.”
- This framework does not clearly articulate its connections with W&M’s recent diversification plans and actions, like the 2016 recommendations of the President’s Task Force on Race & Race Relations or Provost Halleran’s Diversity Hiring Initiative Fund. It seems crucial, as we develop this new framework, to have a clear sense of previous attempts (both successful and not) and a clear sense of where W&M is falling short.
- This framework does not acknowledge the demonstrable resource challenges (e.g., salary) W&M faces both in recruiting new diverse faculty and in retaining diverse faculty we have hired. Many past searches have been unsuccessful in recruiting diverse faculty not because of the search process but because our compensation offers to diverse individuals are often significantly below the offers these individuals receive from other institutions. Given our current and unfolding financial crisis, these challenges seem likely to grow.

In sum:

We support--and applaud--the features of the proposed framework that provide clear resources for diverse search processes: pre-planning and pool-cultivation; anti-bias training and safeguards; student participation; staffing support for compliance and oversight; clearly defined aims, gathering information about success in relation to those aims, and commitment to revisiting and revising processes.

We do not support features of the framework that do not recognize differences in candidate pools and markets and/or that threaten to slow search processes down. We strongly believe that, if adopted, such features of the framework will actively harm our endeavors to diversify W&M’s faculty.

We look forward to partnering with you to refine this framework and to continuing W&M’s faculty diversification.

Appendix C: Collective Views from the Computer Science Department (4 pages)

Potential Adverse Effects of the Proposed Pilot Hiring Program

The Computer Science department strongly agrees on the importance of diversity among William & Mary faculty, a principle that has been part of our hiring practices. As a matter of fact, several of the steps that are outlined in the proposed hiring document are already standard practice in our department (e.g., identification of candidates and targeted marketing by our department, student participation, etc). Nevertheless, we would like to point out that certain proposed action items may be missing some critical components and will have an adverse effect on our future hires. This is especially true given the highly competitive nature of the CS market where 30% of tenure-track jobs stay unfilled^[2], and candidates (and especially the handful of minority ones) are lured to highly lucrative positions in industry or top-ranked universities. Our key concerns are outlined below.

1. Diversity comes in many shapes and forms: the case of Computer Science

The concept of underrepresented minorities is diverse when it comes to academia. For example, in Computer Science (CS) women are dramatically underrepresented. Even after decades of federal and institutional initiatives, women earn only 20% of CS degrees and only 19.4% of tenure-track CS faculty are women^[1,2](see attached Table 1 that shows recent statistics in Computer Science). So, while we are trying to remedy this situation by trying to recruit female faculty members and make a substantial impact on improving diversity in our field, this issue does not appear to be covered under the proposed plan. Accordingly, we feel that a more thorough study of what constitutes underrepresentation across different academic fields would be extremely beneficial, to help the university better capture the complex patterns of this concept in academia and better define goals.

2. On our need for resources, agility, and expediency in pursuing our target hires

While for every hiring opportunity we make a concerted effort to hire women and minorities, our success is moderate at best. The reason is rather obvious: we are not alone in this pursuit, as the issue of underrepresentation is not a W&M issue, but rather a national one^[2]. Besides women, the scarcity of other minorities in CS is striking. Only 4 Black or African American (1.1%) and 5 Hispanic (1.3%) chose a tenure-track job in 2018-19 in the entire US amidst 422 positions, reflecting also similarly low percentages of Ph.D. awarded to minorities (see Table 1). Accordingly, the candidates that we are pursuing often have multiple offers from other Universities, with superior salary and startup packages. We are happy to see that the University recognizes the need to apply *resources* to support such hiring efforts, under Section 1 (Governance) of the circulated document, and applaud this move.

However, while resources are one of the parameters, agility and expediency are another equally important dimension. In recent years, 30% of the announced tenure-track jobs in Computer Science stay unfilled^[2]. We need to move fast to hire, and we are very concerned that the proposed introduction of '*Search Advocates*' (SA) and the '*Talent Acquisition Specialist*' (TAS) in the search committees (Section 2 of the document) is counter to that goal.

Firstly, this could lead to substantial *logistical* issues. Schedules are very complicated to coordinate with campus visits by 3-4 candidates per search in one single Department. The coordination complications that would arise when 5 or 10 Departments concurrently pursue hires in the same School and compete for time of the same SA(s) and TAS will be overwhelming.

Equally important is the issue of ensuring domain merit in our searches. The document proposes having a SA and the TAS participate in each search committee (even without voting rights) and we want to express our substantial concerns with this plan. Their lack of domain expertise prevents them from making real contributions during the search process, potentially trivializing the search to get *any* underrepresented candidate as opposed to getting *the right* underrepresented candidate. Hiring a faculty member is not the same as hiring a staff member; it involves evaluating research potential both in depth and within a broader scope, grant writing preparedness, graduate student mentoring, path to leadership within their own field, and many other such nuances. Respectfully, we do not see how this proposed measure would work in a meaningful manner.

As we wholeheartedly share the administration's goal of pursuing increased diversity within the context of academic excellence, we feel that we will be better served by having the SAs and TAS educate and advise faculty in a broader sense (e.g., a mandatory seminar for hiring units at the beginning of the academic year, or activities like the ones listed under Section 3 of the document) rather than participating in individual committees. We also feel that the SAs and TAS should also seek input from the various W&M units to better understand the particularities of underrepresentation and the realistic expectations across various fields, as mentioned above.

We would like to point out that a single person (TAS) or team (TAS and SAs) may not be appropriate for hiring top talent in upper administration positions either. For this task, involving consulting agencies in searches can actually benefit from their wide connections, reduce bias, improve diversity, and increase transparency. For tenure-track positions, however, neither TAS nor consulting agencies are appropriate and therefore we would like to request that more thought is put into these ideas.

Lastly, we would like to address the adverse effects of the proposed policy of requiring the department to give an unranked list of three finalists to the Dean. Given the aforementioned severe scarcity of qualified applicants in general, and more so from minorities, our searches cannot be targeted only to a single area. Therefore, it is common to have one candidate who is far more qualified than the rest or a candidate in a strategic priority research area who is worth pursuing first. Other times, we may not even have three acceptable candidates after the interview stage. The proposed policy will significantly limit the flexibility of searches, the expediency of our response and negotiations, and result in hiring suboptimal candidates.

3. On the particular needs of an R1 Department

We take pride in being one of the R1 Departments of our University, and we would like to point out the different needs of such units compared to units that tend to be more oriented towards teaching. Our faculty are scholars who bring in significant grants to W&M and W&M exposure to their fields. We have achieved this by consistently trying to hire ahead of the innovation curve. We pursue unrecognized top talent, especially in emerging areas, and try to beat the competition to hire them. This requires a vision, scouting, and *expediency*. The results so far are

overwhelmingly positive, as *all* of our recent past hires have achieved prominence in their field while many of them are heavily recruited (sadly often successfully) by higher ranked Universities.

In this context, we invite candidates to give an interview *research* talk rather than a *teaching* session, as proposed by the document (Section 2). At least 30-40 students attend the research talk, and this is a very effective way for candidates to showcase their communication skills and grasp of the field. In addition, our graduate students have a separate meeting with the candidates and provide input to the hiring committee. Requiring a teaching session in addition, or instead of the research talk, will have an adverse effect on our recruitment efforts, as the profile of candidates that we pursue (R1 material) will most likely be put off by such a request, as it may send a wrong signal to them regarding the match between their career goals and William & Mary. Conversely, such a requirement will likely attract candidates whose interests lie almost exclusively in teaching, and respectfully this is not the academic vision that we are pursuing. In a field that changes as rapidly as computer science, excellence in research is a prerequisite for excellence in teaching. And given the excellent teaching record of our faculty we feel that we have been proven right in this belief.

Similarly, requiring candidates to have “*a track record of innovative and intentional approaches to creating learning environments in which under-represented students flourish*” is unrealistic and excessive for the profile of candidates that we recruit: recent graduates with a strong research *potential* in computer science. Typically, these candidates are in the last year of their doctoral studies when we recruit them. With the exception of few fortunate graduates who may come from big schools offering TA experience in classes with strong minority components, or who were advised by senior faculty who could pass on such opportunities, we fail to see why this should be a requirement for recruiting junior faculty. We understand, however, that “*a statement for diversity and inclusion in addition to a statement on teaching and research*” gives them an opportunity to affirm their commitment and ideas on the issue without placing impossible requirements.

4. A more general comment on the proposed pilot program

We certainly agree that measures to raise awareness (e.g., seminars, data analysis based on past practices, evidence-based comparison with our peer institutions) are indeed positive, needed, and always welcome. But instead of trying to expand these activities (with the possible exception of some training efforts as outlined in Section 3), the document appears to be focusing on procedural changes (i.e., through the proposed mandatory inclusion of TAS and SAs in all searches) that do not address the true nature of the problem of recruiting underrepresented faculty.

The problems that CS is facing in our pursuit of underrepresented faculty have nothing to do with our searches per se, and everything to do with systemic issues in our national education landscape. When fishing in a pond that has no fish, the problem is not one's poor fishing technique, but, rather, the lack of fish. We cannot recruit more women and other minorities in CS because there are not enough such graduates annually. In addition, the few graduating minorities find highly lucrative industrial jobs, and the few remaining are attracted by the top universities in the US. Our faculty are well aware of these issues, and we all do our best to

address this national problem one recruit at a time, one class at a time, and one advisee at a time.

We respectfully argue that some of the proposed action items miss the mark, serving as remedies to the wrong problem (i.e. searches), rather than the real one, which is the above-mentioned systemic failures of our educational system on a national level, and the societal issues that lead to this. We certainly welcome further discussion on the issue, and we applaud the University's effort to address this national crisis, but we urge the University to consider the totality of the issue rather than pursuing small symbolic fixes that will only affect negatively our best practices without contributing substantially to the solution that they purportedly pursue.

[1] <https://www.techrepublic.com/article/the-state-of-women-in-computer-science-an-investigative-report/>

[2] Computing Research Association, **2019** Taulbee survey

<https://cra.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/2019-Taulbee-Survey.pdf>

Table 1. Gender and Ethnicity in Computer Science (2018-19) ^[2]				
	PhDs awarded		Newly hired tenure-track	
Male	1313	79.7%	322	76.5%
Female	334	20.3%	99	23.5%
Unknown	2		1	
Nonresident Alien	906	61.7%	59	15.6%
White	365	24.9%	154	40.7%
Asian	151	10.3%	143	37.8%
Hispanic, any race	21	1.4%	5	1.3%
Black or African-American	13	0.9%	4	1.1%
Multiracial, not Hispanic	9	0.6%	1	0.3%
American Indian/Alaska Native	2	0.1%	0	0%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	0.1%	0	0%
Subtotals	1468		378	
Unknown residency/ethnicity	181		56	
Totals	1649		422	

APPENDIX D: American Studies Response (3 pages)

American Studies Response to the President's Faculty Hiring Pilot Implementation Plan :

We applaud the President and Provost's intent to create a faculty hiring plan across William & Mary that will result in a more diverse faculty and more equitable hiring processes. We also appreciate that some faculty (through the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Hiring Working Group) were consulted as this "pilot" plan was being created. Last, we support the strong message this pilot plan sends about the W&M administration's commitment to creating a more diverse faculty body and the general framework laid out in the pilot plan for doing so.

I: Suggestions and Comments:

In the spirit of cooperation and desire to give this "Pilot Plan" the best chances for success we offer the following suggestions:

1. "Diversity"

- a. We recommend that this term – used ubiquitously throughout the proposed pilot plan and President's introductory letter – be clearly defined. Perhaps in a preamble to the pilot plan? Or simply in an introduction to the document and then referenced throughout.
- b. We also strongly advocate that this definition explicitly note the primary causes of the need for diversity at William & Mary. Most visible of this type of move on the part of the university. Most visible of these foundational causes at this moment is structural racism (and, in some contexts, possibly sexism) and the most urgent forms of diversity we must address here is the small number of faculty of color at William & Mary.
- c. We also believe that the plan should endeavor to ensure more permanent positions for contingent faculty who already contribute to making W&M a more diverse, antiracist institution. Systematic change should involve addressing the intersections of structural racism, heterosexism, and pay inequity that organize relations and working conditions among the administration, tenure track faculty, staff, graduate student workers, and the large number of NTEs (nearly 48% of A&S) that make up W&M's faculty body politic. Equitable hiring processes require creating more equitable conditions among these populations

2. Section 2: Structure: apply consistent, up-to-date, evidence-based practices across the university

- 1) We support the "consistency" across W&M in hiring practices and processes that the President mentions in her introductory letter. National evidence suggests that this kind of uniformity across a campus is a key foundation for creating more equitable faculty hiring processes and outcomes.
 - a. We also are aware of and draw your attention to the differential hiring pools in various disciplines that might render this "universal" model less successful (in terms of numbers) than desired.. We recommend that the W&M administration acknowledge that different fields of study have different histories of diversity that continue to impact their associated applicant pools in such a way that rewarding "Schools making the most progress in increasing the diversity of their faculty" might exacerbate those differences when perhaps MORE resources should be committed to Schools making less progress. We ask that the President, Provost, and Deans consider these factors when developing metrics for evaluating the "success" of this Pilot Plan across units
 - b. **"Search Advocates"**: We believe that **"Search Advocates"** should be internal to W&M and drawn from the faculty of the respective schools in which a search is taking place. For instance, an AMST search committee might have a search advocate from Anthropology. This

was the model used successfully at Oregon State. It is not clear to us what sort of “professionals” are being referred to in the pilot plan, but we think that current W&M faculty can be trained and empowered to serve in this important role for each other.

- c. **“Cluster Hires”:** We support **“cluster hires”** as a means of recruiting a diverse faculty and, as important, retaining this diverse faculty once hired. The success of this approach nationally is well documented, and we note that this success has been based on hiring individuals who have overlapping or linked scholarly interests in one or more fields. The national evidence suggests that cluster hires are most successful when they occur within schools, or even departments and programs, not across schools. For instance, the University of Kentucky made several successful cluster hires in which newly recruited faculty shared scholarly interests across their fields and, in one example, were jointly appointed in their respective departments and the Africana Studies Program.
- d. It was not clear what role is intended for the **“Talent Acquisition Specialist.”** Departments and programs could certainly benefit from a staff person supporting the work of search committees campus-wide by assisting, for instance, with add placement, or arranging campus visits. If instead this is imagined as a high-level administrative position for recruitment, this seems unnecessary and even inappropriate for faculty hires. Faculty within a particular field are in a better position to identify candidates for recruitment within that field than is an administrator with no field specialization. Certainly, hiring outside consulting firms for upper administration searches is costly, and the pilot plan suggests W&M could avoid such costs by establishing this position. But does William & Mary intend to pursue many more such upper level administrative searches in the near future? At the moment, this seems like an unnecessary expense.
- e. Currently job ads and all search documents are already submitted for approval and compliance to the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. This office has long been charged with ensuring reasonable uniformity in search procedures. We seek clarification on how the new structures suggested in the President’s Pilot Plan articulate with existing offices and the law.
- f. It is also not clear what was meant by the requirement that “all faculty search committees [would] include (at least) representation from the School undertaking the hire, one Search Advocate and the Talent Acquisition Specialist.” Who or what is the “representation from the School?” This current plan would add an additional 3 members to all faculty search committees. We strongly suggest that an internal search advocate be the only member added to such committees. That was/is the form of the successful Oregon State model.
- g. **“Integrate students”** – Most departments and programs already have processes for integrating undergraduate and graduate students into the search process. We respectfully suggest that the upper administration seek input from departments and programs about the modes of student integration that they have found most effective and that the universal policies for this allow for variation in how it is done – for instance, within American Studies, we find that meetings with students and presentations to faculty on teaching experience and philosophy are more effective than asking candidates to teach a class. Detailing explicitly how this integration *must* happen is an erosion of departmental and program autonomy and might (as it does in the American Studies case) require a process that differs from our approved Personnel Policies.
- h. **“Identify best practices and integrate them into the hiring process”** - We agree with the spirit of this aspect of the pilot plan and seek clarification regarding the details.
 - i) We are especially in agreement with requiring all job candidates to submit a diversity statement and also incorporating the additional two questions into the general template we use for job interviews.
 - ii) The mandate that “at each stage of the hiring process” candidates should demonstrate a “clear record” of “excellence and inclusive teaching” and have a “track record” of

- “innovative” approaches to teaching may make it difficult to hire ABD candidates or recently graduated Ph.Ds.
- iii) We strongly oppose the requirement that departments/programs submit “unranked” lists of candidates to the dean’s office as the final stage in hiring. Removing the ability of departments/programs to decide on a ranking of candidates and the person to whom they would like to offer the position would be a major blow to department/program autonomy and in many ways departments/programs would be losing their ability to hire.
- i) **The timeline for requesting positions was unclear.** “Begin recruiting for faculty positions a year in advance of the anticipated hire date and, with support from Human Resources, work continuously to identify a diverse pool of talent.” Given that most search requests for TE lines are approved by the Dean’s office in the spring, does this mean units would have to wait an additional year after that approval to begin the search?

3. **Training: empower those who participate in the faculty hiring process**

- a. We agree with the importance of a “pre-season” workshop for all search committees. We would also suggest expanding the numbers of faculty who might attend such workshops beyond the “official” search committees – as in most departments and programs all faculty participate in the evaluation of job candidates. The current language specifies: “No employee may participate in the evaluation of candidates without attending the year’s pre-season workshop to review these evidence-based approaches; participation is required regardless of prior year’s participation because these workshops prepare those hiring for successful competition for the best candidates.” This language suggests that if one is not on the official search committee then you would not be eligible for this training and thus not eligible to participate in the evaluation of candidates.

4. **Accountability: “Create incentives and reward positive results for succeeding in diversifying the faculty”**

- a. We agree with the need for accountability to “measure” whether departments and programs are adopting the best practices outlined in the Pilot Plan. That said, we return to one of our initial points (See 2a. above) that “We also are aware of and draw your attention to the differential hiring pools in various disciplines that might render this ‘universal’ model less successful (in terms of numbers) than desired.” We would ask that the President, Provost, and Deans consider these factors when developing metrics for evaluating the “success” of this Pilot Plan across units.
- i) We are delighted that the administration will: “Consider allocating future faculty lines, to the extent possible” to facilitate the diversification of the faculty body at W&M,”
- ii) Given that the Pilot Plan proposes that such awards would go to “Schools making the most progress in increasing the diversity of their faculty; data will be useful to normalize and benchmark,” we ask that the success of and reward to (new positions) a unit (program or department) be assessed qualitatively (relative to its size and field/disciplinary history).

Conclusion:

We will conclude where we began, that “we applaud the President and Provost’s intent to create a faculty hiring plan across William & Mary that will result in a more diverse faculty and more equitable hiring processes.” We are also aware that in any broad plan, such as this one, the devil (so to speak) is in the details. If you would like to speak further about the American Studies response to these details, I am happy to meet with you at your convenience.