Rubric for Evaluation of Contributions to DEI

Note that UCI provides Guidance on Preparing Diversity Statements for preparing merit and promotion files. You should point the candidates towards this guidance. You should also review (and ask candidates to review) UCI's Commitment to Inclusive Excellence Preamble as well as UCOP Guidelines for The Use of Contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Statements for Academic Positions at the University of California.

You may also want to review and ask candidates to review the helpful video by Vice Chancellor Doug Haynes summarizing Guidelines for Writing Diversity Statements for Faculty Applicants. A helpful example of Faculty Contributions to Inclusive Excellence can be viewed here.

Considerations:

The sample rubric below is modified from UC Berkeley's Rubric for Assessing Candidate Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. It envisions the evaluation of DEI as encompassing three main areas: knowledge and understanding (section 1), track record of activities to date (section 2) and plans for contributing at UCI (section 3). Committees may wish to adjust this categorization to reflect their particular needs and goals, either by altering the categories, adjusting the scores to be awarded or adding additional categories.

Search committees have found it very useful to assign numerical scores to each section of the DEI rubric. This is helpful in identifying and analyzing specific areas of agreement or disagreement as the committee discusses each candidate. The current template suggests assigning an equal points value to each of the three sections (with a score from 1 to 5 for each section). Some committees may, however, decide that one section or another should be weighted more heavily. Or committees may decide that a different scoring system for each section more accurately reflects their needs.

These examples provided in the rubric are offered as illustrative suggestions; they are neither exhaustive nor ironclad. They can be modified to fit the academic and disciplinary backgrounds of applicants in a particular search.

To best make use of the DEI evaluation rubric, we strongly suggest conducting a calibration exercise in advance of reviewing the entire candidate pool. This exercise is described below:

1. Discuss, as a committee, the importance and evaluation of contributions to DEI as one aspect of excellence across research, teaching, and service.
2. Adapt the rubric for use in the particular search, including categories, examples, scores, etc.
3. Discuss ahead of time the kinds of evidence that could motivate low, medium, or high scores.
4. Select a random sample of 8-10 statements from the applicant pool, redacted for candidate name.
5. Apply the rubric to the statements, with each committee member scoring the statements separately.
6. Analyze the scores assigned to each statement across all categories and by all committee members.
7. Discuss interpretations and discrepancies between reviewer scores.
8. Recalibrate the scoring/assessment system as needed.
9. Apply the agreed upon rubric to the entire applicant pool.

After you have finished the calibration and scoring processes, it is very useful for the search committee to share with the rest of the faculty what was learned during this process of assessing DEI contributions. The Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion also welcomes hearing from search committees about how the calibration and assessment process went.

Knowledge about Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion [5 points max]

Score	Examples
1 - 2 Little to no evidence of awareness of DEI issues in higher education or their field	• Little expressed knowledge of, or experience with, dimensions of diversity that result from different identities. Defines diversity only in terms of different areas of study or different nationalities but doesn't discuss gender or ethnicity/race. Discusses diversity in vague terms, such as "diversity is important for science." May state having had little experience with these issues because of lack of exposure, but then not provide any evidence of having informed themselves. Or may discount the importance of diversity. • Little demonstrated awareness of underrepresentation, or of differential experiences, of particular groups in higher education or in their discipline. May use vague statements such as "the field of Biology definitely needs more women" without offering further examples or specifics. • Seems uncomfortable discussing diversity-related issues. May state that they "just haven't had much of a chance to think about these issues yet". • Is unaware or does not understand the personal challenges that underrepresented individuals face in academia or feel any personal responsibility for helping to create an equitable and inclusive environment for all. For example, may state that it's better not to have outreach or affinity groups aimed at particular individuals because it keeps them separate from everyone else, or will make them feel less valued.
3 Some evidence of awareness, but falls short of significant knowledge base or deep interest	• Has some knowledge of demographic data related to diversity and awareness of its importance. • Shows some understanding of challenges faced by individuals who are underrepresented and the need for everyone to work to create an equitable and inclusive environment for all. • Comfortable discussing diversity, equity, and inclusion related issues.
4 - 5 Clear and deep understanding of dimensions of DEI in higher education	• Clear knowledge of, experience with, and interest in dimensions of diversity that result from different identities, such as ethnic, socioeconomic, racial, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and cultural differences. This understanding can result from personal experiences as well as an investment in learning about the experiences of those with identities different from their own. • Is aware of demographic data related to diversity in higher education. Discusses the underrepresentation of particular groups and the consequences for higher education or for the discipline. • Comfortable discussing diversity-related issues (including distinctions and connections between diversity, equity, and inclusion), both in writing, and in a job talk session and one-on-one meetings with students, staff, and faculty. • Understands the challenges faced by underrepresented individuals, and the need for all students and faculty to work to create an equitable and inclusive environment for all. • Discusses diversity, equity, and inclusion as core values that every faculty member should actively contribute to advancing.

Track Record in Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion [5 points max]

Score	Examples
1 - 2 Describes few or no past efforts in any detail	• Participated in no specific activities, or only one or two limited activities (limited in terms of time, investment, or role). • Only mentions activities that are already the expectation of faculty as evidence of commitment and involvement (for example, "I always invite and welcome students from all backgrounds to participate in my research lab, and in fact have mentored several women." Mentoring women scientists may be an important part of an established track record, but it would be less significant if it were one of the only activities undertaken and it wasn't clear that the candidate actively conducted outreach to encourage women to join the lab). • Descriptions of activities are brief, vague, nominal, or peripheral ("I was on a committee on diversity for a year", or "I attended a workshop at a conference).
3 Some evidence of past efforts, but not extensive enough to merit a high score	• Evidence of active participation in a single activity, but less clear that there is an established track record. • Limited participation at the periphery in numerous activities, or participation in only one area, such as their research to the exclusion of teaching and service. • In describing mentoring of underrepresented students, gives some detail about specific strategies for effective mentoring, or awareness of the barriers underrepresented students face and how to incorporate the ideas into their mentoring. • Membership in a student or professional organization that supports underrepresented individuals.
4 - 5 Sustained track record of varied efforts to promote DEI in teaching, research, or service	• Describes multiple activities in depth, with detailed information about both their role in the activities and the outcomes. Activities may span research, teaching and service, and could include applying their research skills or expertise to investigating diversity, equity and inclusion. • Consistent track record that spans multiple years (for example, applicants for assistant professor positions might describe activities undertaken or participated in as an undergraduate, graduate student and postdoctoral scholar) • Roles taken were significant and appropriate for career stage (e.g., a candidate who is already an assistant professor may have developed and tested pedagogy for an inclusive classroom and learning environment, while a current graduate student may have volunteered for an extended period of time for an organization or group that seeks to increase the representation of underrepresented groups in science). • Organized or spoke at workshops or other events (depending on career stage) aimed at increasing others' understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion as one aspect of their track record. • Served as a leader in a student or professional organization that supports underrepresented individuals.

Plans for Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion [5 points max]

Score	Examples
1 - 2 No personal plans to advance DEI	• Vague or no statements about what they would do at UCI if hired. May even feel doing so would be the responsibility of someone else. • Describes only activities that are already the minimum expectation of UCI faculty (e.g., being willing to supervise students of any gender or ethnic identity). • Explicitly states the intention to ignore the varying backgrounds of their students and "treat everyone the same." • States that would be happy to "help out" but seems to expect the University or department to invite or assign them to activities.
3 Some ideas about advancing DEI, but not much detail	• Mentions plans or ideas but more is expected for their career stage. Plans or ideas lacking in detail or clear purpose (for example, if "outreach" is proposed, who is the specific target, what is the type of engagement, and what are the expected outcomes? What are the specific roles and responsibilities of the faculty member?)
4 - 5 Clear and detailed plans for advancing DEI	• Clear and detailed ideas for what existing programs they would get involved with and what new ideas they have for advancing equity and inclusion at UCI and within their field, through their research, teaching, and/or service. Level of proposed involvement commensurate with career level (for example, a new assistant professor may plan to undertake one major activity within the department over the first couple of years, conduct outreach to hire a diverse group of students to work in their lab, seek to mentor several underrepresented students, and co- chair a subcommittee or lead a workshop for a national conference. A new tenured faculty member would be expected to have more department, campus-wide, and national impact, including leadership). • Intends to be a strong advocate for diversity, equity and inclusion within the department/school/college and also their field. • References activities already taking place at UCI or universities known to be successful in the field, and how additional or new activities would advance equity and inclusion. • Addresses multiple areas of need (for example, classroom climate, the laboratory, conferences)