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Executive Summary

For some three decades, Northwestern vigorously has pursued affirmative action in admitting students and hiring faculty and staff. While some progress has been made, especially in increasing the representation of women on the faculty, Northwestern can take little satisfaction in its record in recruiting and retaining underrepresented minority faculty. Northwestern’s cohort of tenured and tenure-track African-American and Latino faculty combined amounts to fewer than fifty people, or barely 4% of the University’s approximately 1200-person tenured and tenure-track professorate. This report compares the representation of women, African-Americans, and Latinos on the Northwestern faculty with their representation at peer institutions; Northwestern’s figures are in many cases comparable with those at such institutions. The report also illustrates that the limited numbers of African Americans and Latinos receiving doctorates greatly constrains Northwestern’s ability to increase the representation of these groups. There is no question that the University faces a significant challenge if it is to have a faculty that more closely resembles the increasingly diverse population of the United States.

To help address this problem, in October 2000 Provost Dumas revived the Faculty Diversity Committee and asked it to help him devise initiatives and mechanisms that will further diversify Northwestern’s faculty both in the short- and the long-term. It is clear to the committee that a significant change in approach will be necessary if we are to remedy this situation. It is not enough merely to renew our commitment to faculty diversity; that commitment must be translated into concrete action yielding demonstrable results.

The University Administration and the Faculty Diversity Committee agree that:

- Increasing the diversity of our faculty is crucial to the University’s mission and is of the highest priority. Achieving this aspiration is important for a host of reasons—scholarly and creative, pedagogical and social.

- Understanding the value of leading by example and the importance of role models, the University will continue to recruit, hire, and retain women and people of color for top administrative positions.

- While Northwestern faces serious challenges in hiring and retaining faculty members from underrepresented minorities, our aspirations in this area must be at once ambitious and achievable.

- The administration and faculty share the challenge of enhancing faculty diversity.

Action steps are spelled out to achieve these shared ambitions. The University will make available $1,000,000 to support initiatives that hold promise of increasing the numbers of minorities and women in disciplines where they are currently significantly underrepresented. These initiatives include allocating resources for faculty diversification, including diversification expectations in the school hiring plans, tracking hiring outcomes, intervening when units fail to advance diversity, and cultivating relationships with minority graduate and post-graduate students at other institutions.
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I. State of Faculty Diversity at Northwestern

For some three decades, Northwestern vigorously has pursued affirmative action in admitting students and hiring faculty and staff. While some progress has been made, especially in increasing the representation of women on the faculty, Northwestern can take little satisfaction in its record in recruiting and retaining underrepresented minority faculty. Indeed, as the demographic data presented later in this report show, the University faces a significant challenge if it is to have a faculty that more closely resembles the increasingly diverse population of the United States. Particularly distressing is the low number of African-Americans and Latinos on the University’s tenured and tenure-track faculty. The twenty-two tenure-track African-American faculty members could easily fit in a seminar room. Were that room to be used for a meeting of the University’s tenure-track Latino faculty, only three more chairs would be needed around the table. Together, Northwestern’s cohort of tenured and tenure-track African-American and Latino faculty amounts to fewer than fifty people, or barely 4% of the University’s approximately 1200-person tenured and tenure-track professorate. Of the University’s 107 departments, only thirty-four contain an African-American or Latino professor; of those thirty-four, only ten include more than one such individual. Clearly, Northwestern’s past efforts at faculty diversification have not yielded satisfactory results.

To address this problem, in October 2000 Provost Dumas revived the Faculty Diversity Committee and asked it to help him devise initiatives and mechanisms that will further diversify Northwestern’s faculty both in the short- and the long-term. Following review of various data and extensive discussion, the committee understands the magnitude of the challenge before it. It is clear to the committee that new actions will need to be taken in order to remedy this situation. It is not enough merely to renew our commitment to faculty diversity; that commitment must be translated into concrete action yielding demonstrable results.

To be sure, this is a considerable enterprise. We should not deny that identifying and successfully recruiting minority faculty, especially in many fields, can be a daunting task. That our peer institutions have encountered the same difficulties and share our challenge is no consolation. It is essential that departments and schools not despair of identifying such faculty just because the prospects appear bleak. We must pursue these candidates as tirelessly as we pursue highly sought-after faculty of any race or gender—by using creative recruitment strategies to attract them to Northwestern.

The immediate challenge is all the greater because Northwestern does not have a substantial core of African-American and Latino faculty who can help attract new scholars. Our schools and departments therefore must implement short-term initiatives designed to draw prospective minority faculty to Northwestern. Our hopes of truly diversifying our faculty will be enhanced greatly once a critical mass of African-American, Latino, and female scholars is reached. Bringing such scholars to Northwestern in turn will help us to recruit and retain faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students alike.

Northwestern does possess some competitive advantages that it should capitalize upon in order to attract women, African-Americans, and Latinos to our faculty. Northwestern’s location in a major urban area certainly makes the University a more appealing place for women and racial minorities to teach and research. The recent backlash against affirmative action in other regions
of the country affords Northwestern an opportunity and a responsibility to assume a leadership role in the effort to achieve racial and gender diversity in higher education. We reject the assertion that affirmative action connotes a dilution of standards or the imposition of quotas. Affirmative action implies that diverse people may possess diverse strengths and that we must be aggressive in identifying and assessing such strengths. Northwestern’s commitment to the highest order of excellence is unflagging. So, too, is our commitment to affirmative action. The two are mutually reinforcing. Given its history, resources, and location, there is no reason why Northwestern should not realize its aspirations to greatness and fairness.

By the same token, we must be mindful of the long-term challenges an institution like Northwestern faces. Our graduate programs must do their part to increase the number of women and underrepresented minorities who receive the doctoral degree. After all, Northwestern and its fellow universities will struggle to achieve faculty diversity so long as the racial and gender composition of the doctoral recipient pool remains grossly inadequate.

Though there have been gratifying pockets of success, Northwestern University is not satisfied with its record in recruiting and retaining women and underrepresented minorities, specifically African-Americans and Latinos, to our faculty. Working with the Faculty Diversity Committee, the University administration commits itself to improving significantly that record. The administration will provide the necessary financial and institutional resources, ensure that faculty diversification is widely understood to be a critical institutional priority, and institute mechanisms to ensure accountability for the achievement of results.

But in the end, the responsibility, like the commitment, must be shared amongst the administration and faculty. It is essential that the members of faculty search committees broaden their applicant pool by seeking out African-Americans, Latinos and women for faculty appointment. The University will assist those committees when necessary in identifying appropriate candidates and will closely monitor all faculty searches to assure that achieving a diverse pool of prospects is a high priority for each one.

Ultimately, Northwestern’s administration and faculty must make enhancing diversity an intrinsic part of our institutional culture. We cannot be satisfied with our state of faculty diversity until it is no longer necessary to use the incentives and disincentives recommended in this report to bring African-Americans, Latinos, and, in certain fields, women to Northwestern.

The remainder of this report contains the fruits of the Faculty Diversity Committee’s labor during the 2000-2001 academic year. It presents a rationale for faculty diversification, indicates what Northwestern has accomplished, asserts what it still needs to accomplish, and recommends programs and initiatives that should be instituted so that Northwestern can achieve the faculty diversity to which it aspires.
II. Underlying Principles

The greatness of a university is directly proportional to the quality of its intellectual community. People from similar backgrounds can and do learn from each other. However, new approaches to knowledge are most likely to be discovered when scholars from a wide variety of backgrounds are brought together to interact with and challenge one another. In a community like ours, social diversity is a mainspring of intellectual and creative progress and contributes directly to academic excellence.

Such diversity is also an important component in the education of our students. As we prepare students to assume leadership positions in our highly diverse, multicultural society, it is essential that they enjoy the opportunity to interact with and learn from faculty, staff, and other students whose backgrounds and perspectives differ from their own. From such interaction comes a broadening of understanding that will equip them, intellectually and otherwise, to function effectively in our democratic society.

A truly excellent faculty implies a faculty whose composition incorporates the diversity of our society and the variety of perspectives that flow from that diversity. Faculty diversity is integral to our larger effort to strengthen our University as a center for the highest order of excellence in scholarship and creative activity as well as in teaching and learning. Our commitment to faculty diversity is of a piece with our larger social commitment to achieve inclusiveness in the Northwestern community.

Finally, our commitment to diversity is grounded in our commitment to do the right thing. We have a responsibility to extend the benefit of a Northwestern education to highly-talented young men and women from all segments of our society. Once they arrive at Northwestern, such students should find mentors and role models among the faculty – elders who have shared some of their experiences, who understand their perspectives, and whose presence bespeaks the University’s commitment to inclusiveness at all levels.

The Northwestern community is clearly a richer and better place as a result of the variety of skills, interests, talents, and backgrounds brought to the University by students, faculty, and staff. Our commitment to vigorous affirmative action in faculty hiring is based upon our conviction that special efforts are justified—and often required—to ensure that that diversity is achieved and enhanced.

---

1 For discussion of the direct educational benefits of diversity on college and university campuses, see Daryl G. Smith and Natalie B. Schonfeld, “The Benefits of Diversity: What the Research Teaches Us,” About Campus (November-December, 2000), pp. 16-23. “Growing evidence supports the notion that faculty diversity (especially in race and gender) is linked to curricular change; the inclusion of issues of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation in the educational process; diversification of scholarship and pedagogical perspectives; and increased support for diverse students…. Studies on cognitive development show that critical thinking, problem solving capacities, and cognitive complexity increase for all students exposed to diversity on the campus and in the classroom.”
III. The Problem: Faculty Demographics at Northwestern

Diversity is, of course, multi-dimensional, including, for example, gender, religion, race, socioeconomic background, national origin, etc. The diversity of the Northwestern faculty could be measured in terms of any of those attributes. The Faculty Diversity Committee has focused its attention on the representation of women and members of two underrepresented minority groups: African-Americans and Latinos.

In adopting this focus the members of the committee were aware that its analysis of faculty diversity was necessarily incomplete. For example, in some fields, Asian-Americans are underrepresented on our faculty. And Native Americans are all but invisible on the faculty. The committee’s focus implies no indifference to the varieties of diversity about which members of the community could legitimately be concerned. Instead, the committee has chosen to highlight some types of diversity it believes demand especially urgent attention.

In the inclusion on the faculty of women, African-Americans, and Latinos, Northwestern University has a distinctly mixed record. Though we can hardly be complacent about our successes, we have made steady progress in hiring and retaining female faculty members. Our success with African-Americans and Latinos is far less satisfactory; in fact, the committee believes that the University faces a serious institutional challenge if we are to increase the representation of these groups on our faculty.

---

2 It bears noting that the figures presented in this report are drawn from the University’s Human Resources Information System and reflect the self-identification of faculty as female, African-American, Latino, etc. The data may thus be imprecise.
A. Women Faculty

As the above figure shows, since Fall 1987, the number of tenured and tenure-track female faculty has increased steadily from 207 (15.7%) to 264 (22.1%) in Fall 2000.3

In assessing our situation with female as well as African-American and Latino faculty, it is helpful to compare the representation of these groups at Northwestern with their representation at peer institutions. A 1998-99 study by the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) provides useful data. (The COFHE institutions included in this study are: Brown, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Duke, Georgetown, Harvard, Northwestern, Penn, Princeton, Rice, Rochester, Washington University, and Yale.)

During the 1998-1999 academic year, women constituted 13.5% of Northwestern’s Professors, 30.2% of its Associate Professors, and 34.4% of its Assistant Professors. By comparison, during the same academic year, the mean for female faculty at COFHE institutions was 14.7% for Professors, 31.1% for Associate Professors, and 36.0% for Assistant Professors. The highest percentage of female faculty at a COFHE institution was 20.0% for Professors, 39.5% for Associate Professors, and 48.6% for Assistant Professors. By comparison with its COFHE peers, in the hiring and retention of women faculty, Northwestern has a record in which we can take some modest satisfaction. As recently hired women progress to the full professor rank, our standing there should improve significantly.

3 Throughout this report we have focussed especially on tenured and tenure-track faculty, since members of this cohort are most likely to be a continuing presence at the University. At the same time, we recognize that many non-tenure-track faculty—e.g., lecturers, clinical faculty, etc.—have long and distinguished service. Women constitute 29.9% of Northwestern’s full-time faculty (this figure includes tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty). Comparable figures for African-Americans and Latinos are 2.0% and 2.2%, respectively.
B. African-American Faculty

In terms of numbers, our record in hiring and retaining African-American faculty is far less impressive than is our record with women. Still, our record with African-Americans is better than that of many peer institutions. In Fall 1987, we had 14 tenured and tenure-track African-American faculty, representing 1.1% of the total tenured and tenure-track cohort. Over the next several years, the numbers grew steadily and nearly doubled by Fall 1997, when 27 African-

---

4 The COFHE survey on which the following table is based excluded certain groups of faculty members—e.g., medical school faculty—who have been included in our demographic description of the Northwestern faculty. Though the COFHE figures are incomplete and are based on a different total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty, they do allow for comparability across COFHE institutions.
American faculty represented 2.2% of the tenured and tenure-track cohort. Our modest progress in the early 1990s has been eroded since then. In Fall 2000, 22 African-Americans represented 1.8% of the tenured and tenure-track faculty; 8 were full Professors, 5 were Associate Professors, and 9 were Assistant Professors.

The 1998-1999 COFHE study shows that there was a higher percentage representation of African-American faculty at the junior ranks at Northwestern than at most peer institutions. But the very small number of African-American faculty here and elsewhere demonstrates the gravity of the challenge Northwestern shares with its peers in recruiting and retaining African-American faculty. During that year, African-Americans constituted 1.6% of Northwestern’s Professors, 4.7% of its Associate Professors, and 4.2% of its Assistant Professors. During the same academic year, the mean representation of African-American faculty at COFHE universities was 2.3% for Professors, 3.5% for Associate Professors, and 3.3% for Assistant Professors. The highest percentages of African-American faculty at a COFHE institution were 4.2% for Professors, 6.4% for Associate Professors, and 7.6% for Assistant Professors.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN FACULTY AT SELECTED COFHE INSTITUTIONS: 1998-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ivy</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>Non-Ivy</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ivy</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>Non-Ivy</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>Non-Ivy</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Non-Ivy</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Ivy</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the COFHE survey on which the following table is based excluded certain groups of faculty members—e.g., medical school faculty—who have been included in our demographic description of the Northwestern faculty. Though the COFHE figures are incomplete and are based on a different total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty, they do allow for comparability across COFHE institutions.
The representation of Latino faculty resembles in many ways the representation of African-Americans. The numbers and percentages are much lower than we desire, and they have recently declined after peaking in 1997. In Fall 1987, Northwestern had 9 (0.7%) tenured and tenure-track Latino faculty. Over the next decade, the figures rose to 28 (2.2%) in Fall 1997. Since then they have fallen to 25 (2.1%) in Fall 2000; of those 25, 14 are full professors, 3 are associate professors, and 8 are assistant professors.

Again, comparison with other COFHE institutions is instructive and underlines the distance Northwestern must travel in including Latinos on the faculty. During the 1998-1999 academic year, Latinos constituted 1.2% of Northwestern’s Professors, 1.9% of its Associate Professors, and 0.9% of its Assistant Professors. During the same academic year, the mean for Latinos at COFHE universities was 1.4% for Professors, 1.8% for Associate Professors, and 2.9% for Assistant Professors. The highest percentages of Latino faculty at COFHE universities were 2.5% for Professors, 5.2% for Associate Professors, and 7.9% for Assistant Professors.
D. Summary of Faculty Demographics

Northwestern’s record in the hiring and retention of female, African-American, and Latino faculty is mixed. While the growth in female representation has been encouraging, in some academic areas, women remain seriously underrepresented; especially in those areas, affirmative action searching for female faculty must be a high priority. Improving the representation on the faculty of African-Americans and Latinos presents a far broader University challenge. In exchanges with the Faculty Diversity Committee and elsewhere, the University administration has clearly announced its commitment to improving our record in this area; and, as this report announces, resources will be made available by the administration to assist in this effort. The administration’s verbal and financial support is welcome. But the challenge of enhancing the diversity of the faculty is a challenge shared jointly by the administration and the faculty. The administration must provide the resources necessary to achieve this expectation, ensure that the expectation is widely understood to be a critical institutional priority, and institute mechanisms to ensure accountability for the achievement of results. However, faculty appointments originate not with the administration but with faculty search committees. If we are to make progress in this area, it is essential that the members of those committees seek out women and members of underrepresented minority groups for faculty appointment.

6 As with the data for women and African-Americans, the COFHE survey on which the following table is based excluded certain groups of faculty members—e.g., medical school faculty—who have been included in our demographic description of the Northwestern faculty. Though the COFHE figures are incomplete and are based on a different total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty, they do allow for comparability across COFHE institutions.
IV. Availability Issues

A. The Pipeline

Northwestern’s difficulty in recruiting and retaining African-American and Latino faculty must be seen in the context of the availability of such young scholars for academic positions at institutions like Northwestern. We recognize the modest number of African-American and Latino scholars receiving doctorates must not imply the inevitable failure of efforts to diversify our faculty. Still, the small number of African-American and Latino scholars inhibits our efforts to diversify our faculty – a constraint that we have worked, and continue to work, to ameliorate.

Nationally, the growth in the number of women receiving the doctorate has been dramatic. In 1969, only 3,388 doctorates were awarded to women, representing 13.2% of all doctorates awarded. By 1979 the number had more than doubled, to 8,937 or 28.6%. Two decades later the figures had more than doubled again, so that 17,493 women received doctorates, 42.5% of all doctorates awarded that year.

Unfortunately, this dramatic growth has not been matched by similar growth in the receipt of doctorates by African-Americans and Latinos. The number of Latino doctorate recipients has grown steadily between 1979 and 1999 – rising from 470 to 1109. During the same period, the production of African-American doctorates has been erratic. Between 1979 and 1989, the number of African-American doctorate recipients dropped by 22%. By 1994, the percentage had risen again, though by only 4% over the 1979 base. Thanks largely to significant increases in the number of doctorates earned in the sciences and engineering, by 1999 nearly 51% more African-Americans received doctorates than had been the case two decades earlier. Fewer than 3000 African-Americans and Latinos received doctorates from US institutions in 1999, just 7.2% of all doctorates awarded.

The table in Appendix A, at the end of this report, shows the number of doctorates awarded by US institutions during 1999, broken down by academic field (with, in some cases, specific disciplines) and citizenship, gender, and race/ethnicity. The distribution of doctorates among fields is quite uneven. For example, nearly 31% of all doctorates awarded to African-Americans and Latinos were in education. By contrast, doctorates in the physical sciences, biological sciences, and engineering, collectively, accounted for only 27.7% of those earned by African-Americans and Latinos. Throughout the nation only 27 doctorates were awarded to African-Americans and Latinos in mathematics; only 41 in economics; and only 9 in philosophy.

In fact, the number of prospective faculty members from underrepresented groups is even smaller than these figures suggest. Among the African-American doctorate recipients in 1999 who reported that they had made employment commitments, only 57% reported that they would take jobs in academe. Among Latinos, the figure was 59%. Thus, some 40% of an already small pool of minority doctorate recipients take jobs beyond academe.

In some significant measure, the shortage of underrepresented minority faculty members stems from the lack of qualified candidates in many fields in which Northwestern hires. When one recognizes that nearly every college and university in the nation shares Northwestern’s
commitment to diversify its faculty, it is clear that the competition is fierce for promising African-American and Latino scholars in all fields. Northwestern’s challenge is a challenge faced by our peer institutions as well.

B. A Long-Range Remedy

Northwestern has taken a national leadership role in helping address one of the root causes of the very small number of African-Americans and Latinos pursuing studies leading to academic careers. The percentage of African-American and Latino students in The Graduate School has consistently been nearly twice the national average. Between 1990 and 1995, Northwestern enjoyed a surge of African-American and Hispanic graduate students, peaking in 1994 at 10% of the entering class. Since then there has been a nearly steady decline at Northwestern and elsewhere, so that the percentage of minority entrants in The Graduate School is now around 6%. In fact, the Quality Education for Minorities (QEM) Network last year recognized Northwestern for its contribution to the number of doctoral degrees earned by African-Americans, Alaska Natives, American Indians, and Hispanics in the fields of mathematics, the physical sciences, and engineering. Northwestern was one of 27 doctoral degree granting institutions so recognized; those institutions honored accounted for almost 50% of the doctoral degrees in those fields received by minorities between 1990 and 1997, although they represented less than 10% of U.S. institutions offering such degrees.

The Graduate School has pursued a multifaceted approach to the recruitment, retention, career development and placement of underrepresented minorities. For example, the newly formed Life Sciences Minority Graduate Committee, comprised of faculty representing the Evanston and Chicago campus biomedical graduate programs, has focused on recruitment issues. The faculty visit students and faculty at select schools with substantial minority enrollments, including Howard University, University of Texas at San Antonio, Alcorn State, Xavier University in Louisiana, Morehouse College, Chicago State University, Illinois Institute of Technology, and the University of Illinois at Chicago. Through research presentations and workshops highlighting its educational and training opportunities, this outreach effort has emphasized Northwestern’s commitment to minority student success.

The Summer Research Opportunity Program (SROP) is designed to attract talented minority undergraduates to graduate study generally, and Northwestern in particular. Now a well-established initiative of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), the SROP offers paid sponsored summer internships and the opportunity to work with leading faculty throughout Northwestern. SROP participants become familiar with the various kinds of research pursued by the faculty and have opportunities to strengthen skills in oral and written communication and to participate in the SROP conference of the CIC. With financial support from institutional, government, and corporate sources, the SROP has hosted from 20-25 students annually since 1986.

For further information on initiatives of The Graduate School to increase minority participation in graduate education at Northwestern, see the School’s 2000 “Minority Report” at http://www.northwestern.edu/graduate/minority-affairs/minority_report_2000.htm. This report contains useful suggestions to departments and faculty members on strategies for increasing minority enrollment.
The Graduate School has also supported the efforts of the Black Graduate Student Association (BGSA) to provide mentoring, community, and fellowship that draws students into a rich and supportive environment. Current minority graduate students have also taken an active role in the recruitment of new minority students and have worked closely with The Graduate School to serve as “buddies” of newly enrolled students. The BGSA also sponsors an annual symposium that provides a forum for scholarly presentations.

Northwestern thus has taken a leadership role in increasing the number of African-Americans and Latinos in the graduate “pipeline” often leading to academic careers. But, as with faculty hiring, institutional efforts are incomplete without the active commitment of departments, directors of graduate study, and individual faculty members. As The Graduate School noted in its 2000 Minority Report, “The department is the critical factor in determining where a student will enroll for graduate study. An admitted student is most likely to select a department that evidences genuine interest in the student and that makes it clear to the student what the department will do to support and facilitate his/ her graduate study and research.”

V. Common Concerns

The University Administration and the Faculty Diversity Committee agree that:

• Increasing the diversity of our faculty is crucial to the University’s mission and is of the highest priority. Achieving this expectation is important for a host of reasons—scholarly and creative, pedagogical, and social. The achievement of faculty diversity is integral to the University’s achievement of the highest order of excellence.

• Understanding the value of leading by example and the importance of role models, the University will continue to recruit, hire, and retain women and people of color for top administrative positions.

• While Northwestern faces serious challenges in hiring and retaining faculty members from underrepresented minorities, our expectations in this area must be at once ambitious and achievable.

• The administration and faculty share the challenge of enhancing the diversity of the faculty.
VI. Expectations and Means to Achieve Them

Northwestern aspires to lead peer, private research institutions in the representation of women, African-Americans and Latinos. This effort will require bringing to bear the substantial intellectual capital and willpower of Northwestern’s administration and faculty.

To finance this effort, the University will make available $1,000,000 to support initiatives that hold promise of increasing the numbers of minorities and women in disciplines where they are currently significantly underrepresented. The Faculty Diversity Committee challenges administrators and faculty members to propose uses for these resources consistent with the following strategies or other strategies.

Listed below and grouped by goal are strategies the committee believes are potentially helpful.

A. Increase the Representation of Women and Underrepresented Minorities

- Provide financial support to schools and departments, as appropriate, to facilitate hiring of women and underrepresented minorities:
  - Bridge funding: the Provost’s Office supports a position until the next vacancy occurs in the department.
  - Step-down funding: the Provost’s Office’s support for a position decreases annually over a three- to five-year span from 100% to 0%, thereby allowing a school/department gradually to incorporate the cost of hiring a new faculty member into its budget.
  - Incremental position to the unit: when the conditions in a particular hiring unit warrant, the Provost’s Office authorizes the creation of an additional tenure-track line.

- Incorporate expectations for hiring women and underrepresented minorities as an integral part of the annual school hiring plans. Specifically, in consultation with departments, deans will be expected to identify opportunities for such hiring for individual departments and programs over multi-year periods. Progress towards fulfilling these expectations will be monitored by the provost and Faculty Diversity Committee. Success in meeting these ambitions will be a factor in evaluating deans and departments.

- Intervention by the Provost’s Office and/or cognizant Dean’s Office when units have been unsuccessful in hiring women and members of underrepresented minority groups, despite availability of scholars in those fields. If necessary, the Provost and/or Dean will re-evaluate the immediate faculty hiring plans of these units.

- Create ad hoc working groups around disciplinary nodes (on the model of the Cross-School Hiring Task Force) to stimulate creative thinking among departments and programs to identify and recruit minority (and, in some disciplines, female) scholars and artists. Special attention might be paid to interdisciplinary areas in which Northwestern is strong and in
which significant numbers of women/underrepresented minorities are pursuing graduate study.

- Support programs and seminars on disciplinary topics that bring pre- and post-doctoral scholars to campus in order to introduce women and underrepresented minorities to Northwestern.

- Increase pool of prospective hires by systematically identifying and cultivating faculty and advanced graduate students at other institutions who might consider positions at Northwestern.

- Track career progress of underrepresented minority graduates from Northwestern, in hope that some might be persuaded to return as faculty.

B. Attend to Local Issues Related to Attracting and Retaining Excellent Female and Minority Faculty

- Recognizing that institutional culture is an important factor in faculty satisfaction, take steps to ensure that female and minority faculty feel welcome in departments and schools.

- Track the reasons for losing women and minority faculty through confidential exit interviews to identify ways to improve our retention rate.

C. Develop Future Faculty

- Expand efforts by the Graduate School and departments to increase the number of underrepresented minorities attending graduate school in preparation for academic careers.

- Develop post-doctoral programs to assist women and underrepresented minorities in early stages of their careers.

- In appropriate fields, develop “pre-faculty” positions designed to attract women and underrepresented minorities. Unlike most post-doctoral positions, “pre-faculty” positions would be explicitly preparatory for a tenure-track position at Northwestern.

- Include female and underrepresented minority graduate students on faculty search committees both to diversify the search committee and to provide such students with valuable committee experience.

All members of the Northwestern community are encouraged to submit proposals for funding for initiatives described in this Report—or for other initiatives consistent with the ambitions presented here. Proposals received by October 15, January 15, and April 15 will be reviewed within that academic quarter. Proposals should be addressed to the Secretary of the Faculty Diversity Committee, Office of the Provost, Rebecca Crown Center 1-112, Evanston Campus.

The success of the initiatives set forth in this Report—and the accompanying financial commitment from the University administration—will be systematically reviewed during the 2004-2005 academic year.
In allocating the funds committed in this Report, the Provost will, whenever possible, seek the advice of the Faculty Diversity Committee and the cognizant dean(s).
## Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL FIELDS</strong></td>
<td>41140</td>
<td>29922</td>
<td>17493</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td>6324</td>
<td>3872</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td>5337</td>
<td>2873</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIFE SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td>8126</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>3620</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>4118</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL SCIENCES</strong></td>
<td>7036</td>
<td>5610</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3667</td>
<td>3230</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANITIES</strong></td>
<td>5468</td>
<td>4576</td>
<td>2658</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Lit</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE</strong></td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Literature</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td>6557</td>
<td>5609</td>
<td>4196</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Other Fields</td>
<td>2292</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Fields</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>