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Research questions

• How has recruitment-level engagement with Contribution to Diversity (C2D) statements varied?
  • Over time?
  • By field?

• Does engagement with C2D statements vary among applicants by gender and race/ethnicity?
  • Disparities in submission?
  • Disparities in content?
Data

• **Evaluating Equity in Faculty Recruitment**
  • All campuses of the University of California
    • Medical sciences excluded, targeted searches excluded
    • Campus-years with institution-level C2D requirement excluded
  • 2013-2017 academic years:
    • 1,638 recruitments for assistant professors
    • 138,372 applications total
    • 40,036 applications to recruitments with C2D statements optional

Fields

- Agriculture & Natural Resources = 49
- Engineering = 121
- Biosciences = 99
- Math, Stats, Computer Science = 46
- Physical Sciences = 89
- Social Sciences = 142
- Visual & Performing Arts = 71
- Humanities & History = 61
- Languages & Cultural Studies = 99
- Professional Schools = 90
Variation in recruitment-level engagement with C2Ds

How has the requirement of C2D statements changed over time?

Diversity Statement Requirement by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not Asked</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How has the requirement of C2D statements changed over time?

**Diversity Statement Requirement by Year**

- **2013-14**: 81% Not Asked, 8% Optional, 11% Required
- **2014-15**: 45% Not Asked, 34% Optional, 21% Required
- **2015-16**: 45% Not Asked, 10% Optional, 45% Required
- **2016-17**: 66% Not Asked, 28% Optional, 0% Required
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How has the requirement of C2D statements changed over time?

Diversity Statement Requirement by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not Asked</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Does engagement with C2D vary by field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Diversity Statement Requirement by Field, 2015-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>![Graph showing engagement across fields]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>![Graph showing engagement across fields]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>![Graph showing engagement across fields]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stats, CompSci</td>
<td>![Graph showing engagement across fields]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>![Graph showing engagement across fields]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>![Graph showing engagement across fields]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</td>
<td>![Graph showing engagement across fields]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>![Graph showing engagement across fields]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td>![Graph showing engagement across fields]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Schools</td>
<td>![Graph showing engagement across fields]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph above shows the percentage of diversity statement requirements for different fields from 2015-2017. The requirements vary significantly by field, with some fields requiring diversity statements more often than others.
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Does engagement with C2D vary by field?

![Diversity Statement Requirement by Field, 2015-17](chart)

- Ag & Natural Resources: 49% (Optional), 51% (Required)
- Engineering: 47% (Optional), 52% (Required)
- Biological Sciences: 47% (Optional), 47% (Required)
- Stats, CompSci: 35% (Optional), 60% (Required)
- Physical Sciences: 36% (Optional), 53% (Required)
- Social Sciences: 44% (Optional), 34% (Required)
- Vis & Performing Arts: 44% (Optional), 35% (Required)
- History & Humanities: 45% (Optional), 43% (Required)
- Lang & Cultural Studies: 53% (Optional), 53% (Required)

Legend:
- Yellow: Optional
- Green: Required
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Variation in applicant engagement with C2Ds

Who submits a contributions to diversity statement when doing so is optional?

Percent of applicants submitting C2Ds when not required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Asian-American</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variation in applicant engagement with C2Ds

Are there differences by race and gender in the content of the submitted statements?

– Document length:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Number of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>461.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>559.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-URM</td>
<td>485.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>545.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Are there differences by race and gender in the content of the submitted statements?

– Topics addressed:
Variation in applicant engagement with C2Ds

Percent of C2Ds addressing the topic by gender

- Diversity
- Equity and Inclusion
- Social Justice
- Underrepresented groups
- International students, experience
- Female students, gender equity
- Sexual orientation/identity
- My research
- Teaching experience
- Committee service
- I have been ...
- I will ...

Men vs. Women
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Graph showing the percentage of C2Ds addressing the topic by gender.
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Percent of C2Ds addressing the topic by race/ethnicity
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- Green: Asian American
- Orange: URM
- Gray: White
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Summary

• Increased use of C2D statements
  • Variation across disciplines

• Gender and race disparities in engagement with C2D statements
  • Submission behavior
    = tax if C2D is not required
  • Evidence of differences by race and gender in content