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● UBC Faculty of Science has closely tracked metrics on
  ○ Existing faculty
  ○ Faculty recruitment

● Visible minority/ Racialized faculty
  ○ Have a larger diversity gap than female faculty
  ○ Glaringly under-represented in leadership
  ○ Face gatekeeping during hiring
Intersectional diversity of tenure-stream faculty in UBC Science
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The Diversity gap of Women (tenure-stream) faculty in UBC Science is closing

Representation in faculty and pool

Differential in representation

The Diversity gap of Racialized (tenure-stream) faculty in UBC Science raises questions
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Differential gatekeeping during shortlisting of women vs racialized candidates (research-stream)

1 in 6 searches had 0 women shortlisted

1 in 3 searches had 0 racialized candidates shortlisted
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2011-2017

26%

24%
Interventions can improve outcomes in hiring

What works in Science:

- Expand shortlists to 5 candidates minimum
- More than 1 member of URG shortlisted
- In person committee training, active learning
- Second look of short lists
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Interventions can improve outcomes in hiring

Research-stream recruitment in 2011 - present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiring season</th>
<th>Women &amp; non-binary</th>
<th>IBPoC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2017</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we know from UBC Science data

• The UBC Science professoriate largely do not reflect the candidate pool, let alone the student body.

• The % of shortlisted racialized candidates does not match that of the applicant pool, in contrast for women candidates.

• In our hiring process, the % of shortlists with no racialized candidates was ~2x those with no women candidates.

• These represent systemic barriers of differential gatekeeping during hiring.
Survey metrics for Visible minorities - the importance of disaggregated visible minority data

- Survey questions have great impact on assessing diversity for visible minority/racialized candidates
  - Do you identify as a member of a visible minority/racialized group?
    - 2020 & 2021 - 34%, yes
  - How do you identify your census sub-group?
    - 2020 & 2021 - 55% indicated non-White, non-Indigenous ancestry (i.e., visible minority)
Self-identification as a visible minority by census sub-population response

n=2765
Lessons from Science metrics-driven approach

- Hiring and gate keeping
- Uptake in equity census
- Survey census subpopulation, Disaggregation of visible minorities
- Expand shortlists, More than 1 Under represented group member
- Require diversity statement
- Accountability on shortlist diversity
- Groom diverse leadership
- Intersectional lens
Changes at the Institutional level

What gets measured gets done- but does it?

- Institutional resistance; equity diverting
- Individual versus Institutional biases
- Commitments required
  - Director/VP/AD for EDI
  - Multiple champions for culture shift
  - Data science approach (analyst required!)
  - IBPoC student/PDFs awards, training programs
- Accountability
  - Identify the roadblocks
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