AFD Climate and Retention Pilot Intervention Program
UC Davis, UC San Francisco, UC Berkeley

0.1. Contact information

UC Berkeley:

- Sharon Inkelas, Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty and Special Faculty Advisor to the Chancellor on Sexual Violence/Sexual Harassment (inkelas@berkeley.edu)
- Karie Frasch, Director, Office for Faculty Equity & Welfare (kfrasch@berkeley.edu)

UC Davis:

- Philip Kass, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (phkass@ucdavis.edu)
- Binnie Singh, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (binsingh@ucdavis.edu)

UC San Francisco:

- Renee Navarro, Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach, Chief Diversity and Outreach Officer (Renee.Navarro@ucsf.edu)
- Elizabeth Ozer, Professor of Pediatrics, Director of Faculty Equity Advisors (Elizabeth.Ozer@ucsf.edu)

0.2. Sponsors

UC Berkeley:

- Interim Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Cathy Koshland (ckoshland@berkeley.edu)

UC Davis:

- Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Mary Croughan (mary.croughan@ucdavis.edu)

UC San Francisco:

- Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Dan Lowenstein (lowenstein@ucsf.edu)

DEIBlueprint

1. Abstract

DEIBlueprint addresses department climate by creating an easy-to-use process - a blueprint! - that sets departments up for success in diagnosing and addressing diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB); in short, department climate. All too often, departments are on their own, trying to effectively implement initiatives from campus-wide surveys, fashioning original department climate surveys, analyzing their data, and conjuring action steps in response. This process is time-consuming, often error-prone, sometimes expensive, and potentially uninformed by campus expertise. Using a quasi-experimental design, DEIBlueprint has two components: (1) an online climate survey Question Bank, containing validated survey items participating departments can choose from to create customizable climate surveys appropriate to their unique context; and (2) a Climate Toolkit to support responsive activities. Toolkit elements will be associated with particular issues and span a wide range of accessible activities. The overall aim is to make departments more inclusive for all, increasing faculty retention and success.

2. Background/Overview

Numerous campus climate surveys at UC campuses indicate that faculty from historically underrepresented groups have a more negative experience of climate, including lower levels of respect, increased experiences of exclusion and bullying, and a decreased sense of belonging. Painful events in 2020, spurred in part by the killing of George Floyd by police, further brought to light the ways in which UC falls short in being an anti-racist and fully inclusive institution. The COVID-19 pandemic also illuminated and increased existing inequities.

The quality of both campus and department climate is inextricably linked to our ability to recruit first-choice candidates from underrepresented groups, and to retain them and support their success, satisfaction, and belonging. If they do not feel that UC is a place where they will belong—feel accepted and authentically connected to the institution and people within the institution—UC loses out on exceptional faculty.

Initiatives at the campus level are critical for addressing high-level structural issues and establishing campus-wide principles and goals. However, most faculty live their academic lives primarily within their academic departments, where climate has a direct impact on retention. Departments are unique microclimates, each with their own opportunities and challenges. A faculty member's decision to stay at UC is determined not only by campus-wide principles but on their own lived experience in their unit. Such experiences, when salutary, can lead to long-term success and professional satisfaction, but if a department is unwelcoming and creates a problematic work environment, such experiences can undermine one's self-worth and hasten a departure from the university, if not an academic career.

Many departments understandably want to address and improve climate issues, but they often don't know what to do or how to do it. Well-intentioned efforts can quickly go awry, with negative repercussions for those who are already marginalized. Campus-wide climate survey results, even when drilled down to the department level, typically do not illuminate the nuanced issues that departments want or need to address. Departments often spend time and energy developing their own surveys, which can inadvertently include inappropriate items, or those that can't result in meaningful intervention. Upon receipt of survey results, departments are often equally at a loss. Some departments, typically those with more resources, bring in an expensive outside consultant for a single training or workshop to try to solve the identified "climate problem" (e.g., unconscious bias training). Others simply share the survey results in hopes that awareness will bring improvement. It rarely does; in fact, doing surveys without providing participants a transparent plan for responding with clear and effective actions to what is learned engenders a sense of hopelessness and mistrust among those who contributed honest answers to (sometimes painful) survey questions.

The purpose of the DEIBlueprint pilot intervention therefore is twofold:

1. To create and test the effectiveness of a customizable climate survey bank ("Question Bank") as an easy to use, validated tool to *assess department climate issues* (for example, advising and mentoring, respect, exclusion, inequitable workloads, microaggressions, bullying, sexual harassment, etc.).
2. To create and test the effectiveness of a standardized, affordable departmental climate toolkit ("Climate Toolkit") as an *intervention for use by individual departments*.

This pilot intervention project will leverage the strengths and distinctions among different types and sizes of departments across three different UC campuses. The three-year project period will allow for yearly administration of the climate tool as a baseline assessment, a midpoint check-in, and a final evaluation, together with sufficient periods for departments to implement action plans based on the survey findings, and revise and adjust as needed. Making long-term, sustainable changes in culture and climate takes ongoing effort and commitment at all levels, but we expect that the interventions will result in measurable

positive improvements for participating departments, as well as tools that can be adapted and effectively used by all UC campuses.

3. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for DEIBlueprint embraces two distinct but interconnected areas of consideration: How departments can sustainably improve climate and experience; and how department climate impacts faculty retention.

Improving departmental climate
A social-ecological model is a useful framework for considering how to effectively impact department culture, and increase the likelihood that faculty will thrive. Originally developed by Bronfenbrenner (1979) as a theory to examine child development within the context of family, community, and the broader culture, the social-ecological model can be used to understand how individual relationships, department norms and standards, and broader societal values and issues intersect to influence the department climate and individual experiences of inclusion or exclusion and belonging or othering.

Carr and colleagues' (2016) adaptation of Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory of human development for gender equity in academics is highly relevant to the formulation of our proposed intervention. The authors stress that successful efforts to spur sustainable changes in equity require intervention across multiple levels of the socio-ecological environment, while observing that many institutions target equity at just one or two levels. An important feature of ecological systems theories is dynamic interaction between and across levels of the system: what is happening at each level feeds into, impacts, and is influenced by what happens on all other levels, and subsequently affects the functioning of individuals and groups within the system. With this framing, the experiences of all members of the department community, including students, postdoctoral scholars, trainees, staff, and faculty, are critical to the overall climate. Interventions that address individual relationships within and across populations; department norms, policies, and processes that address inequities and differential experiences; structural inequities; and consideration of the influence of broader societal patterns on how members in the community interact and behave will be most likely to successfully lead to long-term change.

Faculty retention
While many institutions, including the University of California, have focused intensively on diversifying hiring outcomes, until recently less attention has been paid to retention, and specifically to the impact of departmental climate in faculty choices to stay or leave. In a 2018 COACHE study, researchers identified "departmental collegiality" as a primary factor in decision-making for two-thirds of respondents. For most respondents, departmental collegiality was more important than the option of a higher salary. O'Meara and colleagues (2014, 2016) further delineated the importance of "problematic work environments," rather than better academic opportunities elsewhere, in reasons for departure cited in their study of faculty who were not retained at a large public university.

The theory of "psychological contracts" provides a useful framework for understanding how faculty expectations for their experiences influence their decisions to stay or leave. As explained in "Left Unsaid" by O'Meara and colleagues (2016), psychological contracts are unwritten and unverbalized expectations about the mutual relationship faculty expect between themselves and their department. Relational psychological contracts are explicitly related to expectations such as professional development, security, collegiality, and equitable treatment. When unmet or violated, as is disproportionately the case for faculty from underrepresented groups, these types of ruptures tend to cause greater dissatisfaction, feelings of broken trust, and increased likelihood of departure.

DEIBlueprint will use these two theoretical models for the creation and use of the Question Bank, in terms of the types of questions included, and the levels of the department at which they are aimed; and in the creation and use of the Climate Toolkit, where interventions will address the socioecological context as well as the unwritten psychological contracts at play for all members of the department.

4. Project Description

4.1. Description of the project and context

We begin with an illustrative case study of one way in which DEIBlueprint can be relevant for departments. Although the department is not identified, all of the details are accurate.

At many UC campuses, academic departments undergo an Academic Program Review (APR) every 7-10 years. This presents a rare opportunity for the unit and the campus to take a comprehensive look at the unit, informed by recent data trends, and to evaluate its opportunities, challenges, and plans for the future. The APR centerpiece is the unit's "self-study," which expresses the unit's unique culture and provides an opportunity for reflection and critical assessment of the unit's scholarly directions, academic programs, and climate. An External Review Committee site visit then provides the unit an opportunity to consult with respected colleagues from peer institutions. APRs are designed to be forward-looking and to enhance the mission of the institution.

The External Review Committee for Department X learned during its site visit in 2019 that many in the department had concerns about a negative department climate. The committee strongly recommended that the department address its issues. The department spent the 2020 spring semester working with a campus data analyst with limited availability to devise a survey to illuminate what those issues might be. Out of a natural curiosity, the department opted for open-ended questions in which survey participants could disclose their negative experiences. The survey also collected detailed demographic information, in order to learn whether negative experiences differed across demographic lines. Because the information acquired in the survey could have identified participants, the raw data could not be made available to the department. Instead, an administrator in the dean's office was assigned to redact and analyze the results. This took many months. Limited survey results were made available to the department in early 2021. Then the department had to digest the results and decide what if any steps to take in response. This involved researching options available on campus, getting passed from one office to another. At the end of Spring 2021, after time-intensive efforts by the department, the department announced a series of proposed actions responsive to survey questions. By the time the actions are implemented in 2021-22, the original expressions of concern that prompted this herculean effort will be 2-3 years old.

Department climate issues get worse the longer they go unaddressed. While the efforts of Department X are highly laudable, this case study shows that when departments are left to develop surveys and initiate interventions on their own, much time is lost, considerable effort is expended that could be put to better use, and survey best practices may not be followed. Furthermore, the more effort that is required, the less likely under-resourced departments, and those with limited expertise in survey development and quantitative analysis, will be to diagnose and constructively address climate issues. Departments may then lack the necessary resources to begin to address climate change issues that were brought to the forefront.

DEIBlueprint is designed to address both of the systemic issues that delayed Department X and may have deterred many other departments from embarking on climate improvement efforts in the first place. It also provides the opportunity to build off broader campus-wide surveys to facilitate departments being able to engage in more targeted survey follow-up, as well as tools to address and respond to issues at the department level. DEIBlueprint makes available to departments an easy-to-use, customizable, reasonably sized

Question Bank of validated climate survey questions to use to administer a climate survey on a regular basis. The Question Bank will include reporting templates. DEIBlueprint also develops a Climate Toolkit with a framework for intervention steps and processes, offering tailored interventions for departments to select among based on their prioritization of the concerns identified in the survey results report. The quasi-experimental design of DEIBlueprint, in which the survey is administered three times, focused around targeted interventions, provides a natural pre- and post-comparison. This design simultaneously holds departments accountable for climate improvement *and* gives them the tools they need to identify and address issues.

The longer-term goal, once the DEIBlueprint pilot is successfully implemented, is to expand use of the Question Bank and Climate Toolkit to all departments and link their use to Academic Program Reviews and campus climate surveys, building fuller resources and accountability into those processes. The result will be a stronger foundation for DEIB in the academic enterprise.

4.2. Climate survey Question Bank

The purpose of the climate survey Question Bank is to provide participating departments with a set of existing, validated survey items on a variety of topics. Question Bank items will be drawn from existing campus-wide climate surveys, department surveys, and external surveys. Preliminary work on a Question Bank has already begun, drawing upon the following validated survey sources:

- UC Davis COACHE Job Satisfaction Surveys 2017 and 2021 (https://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/faculty-satisfaction-survey-reports-coache)
- UC Davis IDARE Taskforces Initiative (https://health.ucdavis.edu/diversity-inclusion/PDFs/IDARE-Taskforce-BIMSON-toolkit.pdf)
- UC Climate Survey 2012 (https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/services/survey-services/CCS.html)
- MyVoice, Berkeley campus-wide survey of sexual violence and sexual harassment awareness, attitudes, and experiences, 2018 (myvoice.berkeley.edu)
- MyExperience, Berkeley campus-wide survey of climate, 2019 (myexperience.berkeley.edu)
- UC Berkeley Department of Chemistry climate survey, developed by Chrissy Stachl (Stachl & Baranger, 2020)
- Other departmental climate surveys developed at UC Berkeley by the survey team in the Division of Equity & Inclusion
- UCSF Faculty Climate Survey 2017 (https://facultyacademicaffairs.ucsf.edu/faculty-life/faculty-climate)
- UCSF Climate Survey 2021 - to be administered Fall 2021

All departments will include a minimum set of standardized questions, with other questions/modules optional, depending on the needs of the department. The question items will be applicable across all departments (including health sciences, arts and humanities, social sciences, STEM disciplines, etc.), with the exception of an occasional need to alter basic terminology to match disciplinary understanding. The survey that departments administer from the Question Bank is intended to be focused and brief (10-15 minutes), to encourage high rates of participation. Departments can choose to pursue modules that will help them better understand a climate issue they feel they have, knowing that the survey findings may reveal new issues that require attention.

Guiding principles for the Question Bank and use of the survey include:

- all department populations should participate, including students, trainees, postdoctoral scholars, staff, and faculty, recognizing that climate issues impacting one group have negative outcomes for the entire department, but with particular focus on faculty and graduate students;
- only questions whose answers can translate into productive department actions are included;
- no open-ended question items are included to preserve anonymity, avoid disclosures or accusations, and speed data analysis; and
- questions whose answers could require reporting or produce sensitive personal information are not included; accordingly, instructions for those who respond to the survey will make it clear that the survey does not constitute a report to the University.

These guiding principles emerged from campus experiences with past UC campus surveys, including those that were deployed successfully and those which had a bumpier path.

The Question Bank will cover four main topical areas, each corresponding to a module of questions:

- **Advising, mentoring, support, promotion and advancement.** Questions in this section will address subtopics such as workload, clear expectations for academic success, sponsorship, support for research areas, equitable access to resources, and student-faculty relationships.
- **Climate, respect, tolerance.** Questions in this section will address subtopics such as whether interactions in meetings, classes, among colleagues are respectful, and whether department members feel able to address concerns that arise.
- **Belonging, DEI, exclusion.** Questions in this section will address such topics as the degree to which diversity is valued in the department, whether those holding minoritized identities feel a sense of belonging, and whether efforts to promote DEIB are encouraged.
- **SVSH, other harassment, racism and discrimination, bullying.** Questions in this section will focus on such topics as the degree to which members of the department have experienced or witnessed unwelcome behaviors (though without collecting personal details); the extent to which members of the department are aware of expectations, reporting channels, and supportive campus resources; and the degree to which members of the department feel able to engage in bystander intervention.

The survey tool Qualtrics will be used to store the Question Bank items, and can be efficiently customized to run unique surveys with identified items for each participating department, along with the predetermined items all will use. For the purposes of the intervention project, a process will be developed to maintain confidentiality for respondents while also identifying disparities in experience based on identity/affinity group.

4.3. Climate Toolkit

The purpose of the Climate Toolkit is to provide departments with the framework, resources and clear processes needed to address and improve the climate issues they identify through the climate survey. It is intended to be action-oriented, to support departments in making the best use of existing campus resources, and to point to or provide new resources where needed. Each of the three participating campuses will have their own version of the Climate Toolkit. The foundational framing of the processes will be the same, and some electronic resources will be shared, but each campus will also include in its toolkit the unique campus resources that exist for each location.

Guiding principles for the Climate Toolkit and its use include:
- use of a **social-ecological model**, where an understanding of individual relationships, department norms and standards, policies, and broader societal values and issues intersect to influence the department climate and individual experiences of inclusion and belonging;

- obtaining **buy-in across all populations** in a department will result in greater lasting change;
- **shared understanding of terminology and concepts** by all department members will support meaningful discussion;
- long-term department-wide change, including addressing structural aspects of climate, will happen through **intensive commitment and actions on the part of many**, rather than passive attendance by a few at one-time trainings or workshops; and
- departments will benefit from **clear expectations and accountability** that applies to all members of the community.

Preliminary work on a climate toolkit has already begun. These elements consist of skill-building in-person training, online guides for departments to work through, and 1:1 consultations provided by campus offices. Below we provide example interventions that are currently available at the campuses.

4.3.1. Skill-building in-person trainings (examples)
- The UCSF Office of Diversity and Outreach has developed and oversees the [Unconscious Bias Education and Training Program](#) that continues to provide a key foundation for improving our awareness of self as it relates to race, gender and other personal identifiers, understanding unintentional consequences in hiring, assessments and promotions processes, and calling us into action to eliminate microaggressions and bias.
- The "[Differences Matter Initiative](#)" launched in 2015 in the UCSF School of Medicine (SOM) with the explicit goal of making UCSF the most diverse, equitable, and inclusive academic medical system in the country, has developed a full-day training for faculty focused on better understanding and responding to bias and microaggressions, and engaging in by-stander response.
- The PATH to Care [TRAIL Certificate Program](#) is a certificate program at UC Berkeley that gives undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff leadership skills and tools to prevent and respond to violence and harm. The program equips participants with tools to prevent SVSH by improving the climate in various academic and work environments.
- The PATH to Care [Train the Trainer Program](#) trains graduate students to deliver mandatory SVSH Prevention and Education training to their peers. This training model increases the influence peers have in social and academic spaces, and allows student leaders to actively shape campus and department culture.
- [Bystander Leadership from Florida International University](#), geared toward faculty in particular, is a highly successful educational program for faculty members that grew from FIU's ADVANCE Institutional Transformation Grant. It provides training to participants to motivate them from "insight" to "action" to increase inclusion among faculty, as well as to address bias within faculty interactions in positive and prosocial ways. We have been invited to send all principal investigators to this program so that FIU can "train the trainers," who can then return to their campuses and adapt/implement their own bystander training programs.

4.3.2. Online guides for departments to work through
Many issues departments will identify in the climate surveys can be addressed using available online resources. These can be campus-specific, as in the examples below, or external. Use of them would be preceded and followed by activities to engage in discussion and actions, rather than serving as standalone resources.

4.3.2.1. Campus-specific online guides (examples)
- [Living the Principles of Community (eCourse)](#). This on-line course is designed to promote inclusiveness and respect in the work and learning environment at UC Davis. This highly interactive course includes up-to-date information on discrimination, SVSH, affirmative action and

diversity along with the University's policies governing these issues. This course will inform and equip participants with essential knowledge and skills, ultimately resulting in fewer such conflicts, improved morale, decreased institutional liability, and a more respectful and inclusive campus environment.

- Being an Ally Requires Being an Anti-Racist. This UC Davis site contains eleven suggested actions toward anti-racism that can be done individually and in departments, and includes a plethora of resources that faculty can use.
- UCSF Office of Diversity and Outreach maintains the Diversity Hub, a database that houses UCSF's ongoing diversity & outreach related initiatives, allowing the community to explore different ways to support and engage in diversity efforts.
- Preventing Sexual Harassment in your Academic Department (PATH to Care). This innovative toolkit moves a group of decision-makers through a quick, results-oriented process designed to produce a comprehensive plan for preventing harassment in a department. It is based on the best research in the field of sexual violence prevention, as well as specific, recent UC Berkeley research into sexual harassment in the academic context.
- PATH to Care Guidance for Academic Departments Wanting to Hold a Town Hall. When climate issues are reported, departments often wish to hold a town hall. Yet town halls frequently go awry, producing new trauma instead of healing existing wounds. This resource provides guidance around clarifying the goals of the town hall, planning a trauma-informed event, and following up with action afterwards.
- OFEW's DEIB guidance to faculty. This new UC Berkeley website provides a rich array of suggestions for faculty seeking to promote DEIB in their teaching, research, and service. It includes guidance to reviewers (chairs and deans) in supporting and recognizing such work.

4.3.2.2. External online resources (examples)

- American Council on Education's Equity-Minded Faculty Workload guidance, which summarizes "findings and insights learned from the Faculty Workload and Rewards Project (FWRP), a National Science Foundation ADVANCE-funded action research project".
- Accessible Syllabus guidance, a comprehensive guide for faculty wishing to "promote student engagement and agency" through inclusive design.
- The National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD), which UC Berkeley and UC Davis faculty have access to, offers numerous online resources for specific issues, to which the toolkit will link.
- Liberatory Design: Mindsets and Modes to Design for Equity, part of the National Equity Project, is a validated approach to addressing equity challenges and change efforts in complex systems. Materials can be accessed by departments, or workshops can be requested.

4.3.3. Individual consultations

The Climate Toolkit will include descriptions of the various campus offices whose staff can provide expert consultations on particular issues. Describing the issues for which each office is most appropriate, as well as the capacity of each office to provide assistance at short notice, will increase the chances of success upon the first attempt to connect with expert consultation.

For example, UC Berkeley's PATH to Care Center's prevention managers are all available to consult with departments on issues related to sexual harassment prevention or climate more generally. The Office for Faculty Diversity and Departmental Initiatives is available to consult with departments seeking to ameliorate diversity-related tensions, strengthen intergroup relationships, and build shared values around DEI. UC Davis's Office of Academic Affairs, in partnership with its Office of Compliance and Policy and Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, provides training to faculty on numerous topics, including SVSH, anti-racism, and equity issues. UCSF's Office of Diversity and Outreach provides ongoing

consultation and trainings on bias, anti-racism, SVSH, and has developed DEI certificate and champion programs to support leaders who provide ongoing consultation and training across their departments.

Some departments, particularly those that are well-resourced or that are unaware of what the campuses already provide, avail themselves of external paid consultants. The DEIBlueprint Toolkit will not endorse particular private consultants. However, it will include guidance on how to select a consultant.

4.4. Participating departments at each campus

Each campus has invited 3-5 departments, colleges, or schools to participate in DEIBlueprint. The choice was based on several criteria:
- Range of disciplines across campus
- Mix of smaller and larger departments
- Department faculty include women and members of underrepresented groups (for whom retention due to climate issues is a particular concern)
- Departments not currently undergoing in-depth DEIB efforts that would conflict or conflate with the intervention step in this proposal
- Departments not undergoing Academic Program Review during the first two years of the grant
- Departments not at the extremes of negative and positive climate, so that an outcome assessment has the potential to demonstrate a pre-post difference following intervention.

Participating departments, schools and colleges include:

	All Faculty	URM Faculty	Women Faculty
Berkeley			
College of Engineering Civil and Environmental Engineering	36	5.5	9.5
Social Sciences Division Political Science	37	4	10
Arts and Humanities Division English	55	7	25
Math and Physical Sciences Division Statistics	20	1	5
Arts and Humanities Division German, Spanish & Portuguese department cluster	22	5	11
San Francisco*			
School of Dentistry Preventive & Restorative Dental Sciences	79	14	36
School of Medicine Department of Surgery	136	14	49
School of Nursing Social and Behavioral Sciences	15	4	14
School of Pharmacy Department of Bioengineering & Therapeutic Sciences	18	2	8

Davis**			
Agricultural and Environmental Sciences	282	21	100
Biological Sciences	105	8	34
Engineering	195	16	41
Letters and Science	587	76	216
Medicine	217	23	78

* UCSF faculty totals include health sciences clinical and non-ladder rank faculty
** At UC Davis the deans from each of the participating schools/colleges will identify one department to participate in the project (see attached letters of support).

4.5. Project implementation

As soon as the grant is approved, the six Co-PIs from all three campuses will convene as a **Project Leadership Team** to finalize the timelines and processes for the project, and discuss and agree on the job description and recruitment plan for the Program Manager. The Co-PIs for each campus will meet with the department chairs from each of the participating departments from their campus to discuss timelines and processes, and discuss and agree on the composition of **Department Climate Councils or Committees**. The climate councils will ideally be composed of representatives from department faculty, staff, postdocs, and students, consisting of 6 - 8 members. Each campus will then hold a project launch event with the department climate councils from all participating departments, prior to the baseline administration of the climate survey. This will serve as an opportunity to create community, shared goals, and build a network of departments across campus committed to assessing and addressing climate issues.

Participation in the Florida International University Bystander Leadership Program will occur in the 2021-2022 academic year. The dates for the coming year have not yet been established, pending when the university will be able to convene meetings like this one in person; it is not conducted remotely due to the importance of personal interactions during the training.

As part of the pilot intervention, the Program Manager will meet regularly with each department climate council throughout the program, including as they determine the most appropriate items from the Question Bank to include in their survey, as they receive and interpret the survey findings, and as they launch and use the Climate Toolkit and implement activities. The Program Manager will serve as a source of information, guidance, advice, and support to departments throughout the three years.

4.6. Major contributions to the campuses

A benefit of the proposed collaboration among three campuses is the ability to triangulate on both the problems a climate survey will expose and the solutions that can be provided. As part of developing the unique aspects of the toolkits for each campus, we will learn where each campus has strengths that the others can emulate, and where each campus has gaps that others may be able to advise on addressing. For example, all campuses have one or more offices focused on the prevention of SVSH, but have different approaches to prevention and different resources to employ. As part of this project, our campuses will look to each other to improve our own resources. The PIs of the three campuses already enjoy strong relationships and robust communication channels. And as a set, the three campuses comprise an

extraordinary range of departments and professional schools that rivals that of the UC system as a whole. As a result, the tools that emerge from this three-year project will be readily translatable to the other campuses in the UC system.

4.7. Who will lead the project and why

Each campus will have two Co-Principal Investigators and a central campus sponsor. In addition, grant funds will be used to employ a 50% staff Program Manager who will be employed at the Berkeley campus, and be essential to coordinating efforts across all three campuses, and within and across all participating departments.

4.7.1. UC Berkeley

The central sponsor is the EVCP, who has oversight over the planning, development, implementation, assessment and enhancement of all academic programs, policies, and supporting infrastructure. The EVCP is responsible for ensuring Berkeley's academic preeminence by overseeing faculty recruitment, advancement, retention, and renewal. Issues of climate that are germane to faculty retention and success are squarely in the mission of the EVCP. The current EVCP is Paul Alivisatos, but **Cathy Koshland** will take over on July 1 as interim EVCP. As the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education she is a champion for equity of experience for students at Berkeley.

The PIs for this proposal are **Karie Frasch**, Director of the Office of Faculty Equity & Welfare, and **Sharon Inkelas**, Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty. Dr. Frasch and Dr. Inkelas have a strong track record of successful research and intervention efforts at the Berkeley campus and systemwide, including a recent climate and retention grant to implement the Faculty Link program, and the ongoing systemwide study of search committee practices through the Search Committee Chair Survey. They have also provided extensive consultation to groups with two previous successful AFD recruitment grants. Dr. Marc Goulden will serve as the data analyst to provide analyses and summaries of the department climate survey findings. Other partners at Berkeley will include staff in the Division of Equity & Inclusion, the Academic Program Review team, the PATH to Care Center, and the Graduate Division.

4.7.2. UC Davis

The central sponsor is Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor **Mary Croughan**, who is the chief academic officer and oversees all aspects of planning and management of the university, including implementation of all policy, faculty hiring, academic advancement, and college/school resources. Provost and EVC Croughan came to UC Davis following 30 years at UCSF, where she served as the only committee member with continuity from 2000–2010 on the UCSF Chancellor's Committee on Faculty Climate and the Task Force on Faculty Life. Dr. Croughan assisted in developing the first faculty climate survey, analyzing results, developing recommendations, and implementing policies and programs to address issues identified on the survey, including co-leading the Task Force that created a faculty mentoring program for UCSF.

The PIs for this proposal are **Philip Kass**, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and **Binnie Singh**, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The Office of Academic Affairs has received two AFD hiring grants (received in 2018 and 2019) and one retention grant (received in 2019), and has piloted innovative programs and analyses in salary equity, academic advancement, and faculty hiring. Its faculty reference check program for hires at the Associate Professor rank has garnered national (e.g., AAU members) and congressional attention as a model for other universities to avoid "passing the harasser." UC Davis holds a Bronze Award from the American Association for the Advancement of Science's STEMM Equity Achievement (SEA) Change initiative and is a cohort member of the National Science Foundation's Aspire Alliance's IChange Program.

4.7.3. UCSF

The central sponsor is Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor **Dan Lowenstein**, who has oversight over the planning, development, and implementation of all academic and research programs, policies, and supporting infrastructure at UCSF, including the four professional schools, graduate division, global health sciences, and business development and partnerships. EVCP Lowenstein serves as Co-Chair, with Vice Chancellor Navarro, of the UCSF Safety Task Force, with the goal of understanding how structural racism exists in and continues to shape our policies and perspectives related to safety and security, and how UCSF can improve and build upon our policies and practices to ensure they are unbiased, just and fair-minded, while keeping the entire UCSF community safe.

The PIs for this proposal are **Renee Navarro**, Vice Chancellor of Diversity and Outreach, and **Elizabeth Ozer**, Professor of Pediatrics and Director of UCSF Faculty Equity Advisors. Vice Chancellor of Diversity and Outreach, Renee Navarro oversees all of UCSF's campus-wide diversity efforts, and collaborates with the leadership, faculty, staff, and learners to enact initiatives for diversity, equity and inclusion, including UCSF's Anti-Racism initiative. Dr. Navarro served on the UC Climate Survey Task Force, was co-executive leader for Differences Matter in the School of Medicine, and is overseeing efforts to develop and administer a UCSF 2021 Climate Survey. Professor Elizabeth Ozer is Director of the UCSF Faculty Equity Advisor program, served on the UC Systemwide Climate Survey and UCSF Faculty Climate Survey Taskforces, and is Faculty Co-Chair for the development of the UCSF 2021 Climate Survey. She is Chair of the UC Systemwide Committee on the Status of Women, has served as joint-PI on two NIH grants focusing on increasing the number of women and URM in the health sciences, PI on numerous federally funded intervention research grants, and currently serves as PI on a UCOP Advancing Faculty Diversity initiative to increase faculty diversity in departmental leadership positions.

4.8. Potential to scale up the intervention

The strength of this project, with the range of participating departments, and the collaboration across three campuses, is its important potential to scale up for use across the departments of each campus and across the campuses of the entire UC system.

The ultimate goal of the DEIBlueprint pilot is to enable departments to perform annual or biennial climate assessments that can be used to track progress over time, surface any new issues that arise, and respond to them quickly and appropriately. DEIBlueprint can, and should, become linked to Academic Program Review (on campuses with this model), and/or to the campus Office of Academic Affairs that maintains advancement data on faculty, with requests to see data and responsive actions over time becoming a standard element of such reviews. Such requests would, at the present time, be difficult for most departments to meet, particularly less well resourced departments, a set which tends to be dominated by arts and humanities and the humanistic social and cultural sciences. This is a set of departments in which faculty (and graduate students) from underrepresented groups are particularly likely to be found.

Indeed, the idea for DEIBlueprint originally arose out of graduate student requests for departments to be more accountable for climate during the ten years in between Academic Program Reviews. It is essential for departments, and the university, to be accountable to the community.

5. Evaluation

5.1. DEIBlueprint will evaluate climate and retention

Current research on climate and institutional culture change focuses heavily on the attitudes of individuals. However, while it is important to focus on individual faculty members within a department, measuring

meaningful culture change also requires a multi-level methodology that examines changing institutional policy, values, and behaviors. The Climate Toolkit -- developed and informed by the results of the department climate surveys -- will introduce novel, innovative strategies and adapt existing ones, with the intention of evaluating its impact on climate perception as the outcome. This approach builds on prior research and provides a comprehensive assessment of change at both individual and organizational (college or school) levels. At the individual level, we will use annual climate surveys with ordinal scoring to conduct an assessment at baseline, midpoint, and the end of year 3. The toolkit will include documentation of more recent ideas in the area of microaggression, bullying, inclusive excellence and their intersectionality with race, ethnicity and other statuses such as gender identity and socio-economic disadvantage.

DEIBlueprint has a built-in time series evaluation method. The climate surveys in years 2 and 3 can be compared to the results of the surveys in years 1 and 2, using mixed effects regression models to test whether aspects of department climate improved over the intervals between surveys. Intervention activities beginning in year 2 should have an effect that can be measured in subsequent climate surveys. Of course, many factors outside the control of the DEIBlueprint may also have an effect, positive or negative, on department climate, and some issues that are deep seated may only be surfaced and started to be addressed. For example, events external to the university often have noticeable effects on overall morale, and long standing issues or pain points cannot be addressed by practical interventions alone. But the Question Bank will contain specific questions that focus on the perceptions that members of departments care about, and will take steps to improve department climate. For example, one question under consideration for inclusion in the Question Bank is:

"In general, in the Department of X, I feel that I know who to talk with about any concerns regarding departmental climate." [Source: survey developed by the Energy & Resources Group in the Rauser College of Natural Resources, with consultation from the Division for Equity & Inclusion]

If the survey in year 1 reveals that faculty in the department do not know where to take concerns that they have, a target intervention in year 2 that publicizes and normalizes methods for raising concerns should affect the answers provided to this same question in year 2 of the survey.

Another question being considered for inclusion in the Question Bank is:

"In my opinion, the Department of X provides opportunities for students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented or marginalized groups to connect with others who share their backgrounds and affiliations." [Source: survey developed for the UC Berkeley College of Chemistry (Stachl & Baranger 2020)]

If the survey in year 1 reveals that faculty in the department do not have opportunities to connect with others who share their identities or interests, a targeted intervention in year 2 that publicizes and normalizes networking opportunities for faculty should affect the answers provided to this same question in year 2 of the survey.

By using questions that have been developed and previously validated by survey professionals, we are confident that improvement in survey responses will reflect improvement in department climate. It will of course be important to ensure a high response rate.

5.2. Participating departments will evaluate DEIBlueprint

An important element of evaluating the effectiveness of DEIBlueprint will be user experience surveys. We plan to interview the leadership of the participating departments quarterly to assess both the amount of time expended on DEIBlueprint activities and the perception of the utility of those activities. This will allow us to adjust the toolkit components of DEIBlueprint. The buy-in and cooperation of the department's

leadership, together with the relevant deans, will be critical to gaining the widest possible response percentages to intradepartmental surveys, which in turn will mitigate the problem of having the people most likely to adverse affect department climate decline to participate in surveys and DEIBlueprint-related activities.

Furthermore, information collected in this way will enable us to describe to departments we recruit for participation in a future incarnation of DEIBlueprint the nature of the commitment they are undertaking. We believe that departments will be more likely to undertake efforts to improve climate if they know, going in, what to expect.

The three campuses will monitor retention as well in participating departments, with natural "control" groups being departments within the same college/school not participating in DEIBlueprint. We hypothesize that, over time, as climate improves, retention will demonstrably improve as well, although the number of retentions during the three years of this proposal may be too small for robust statistical analysis.

At the conclusion of the project, we will publish a report providing a narrative description of the project activities, as well as quantitative analysis of climate improvement as measured by responses across the three years of administration of the Climate Survey.

6. Timeline

The project will be implemented over a three-year period, beginning in July 2021 and extending through June 2024. The fall of the first year will focus on clarifying goals and processes across the three campuses, identifying project personnel and committees, and finalizing the climate survey Question Bank. The Climate Toolkit will be finalized in the spring of the first year.

Departments will administer the climate survey each spring, with findings provided back to them in the form of themes and recommendations. The second administration of the survey in Year 2 will allow departments an opportunity to assess their progress to date, and to adjust their goals and processes for the next year, and the final administration will serve as a final evaluation point, and an opportunity for closing activities for departments and the determination of their next steps, post pilot intervention.

YEAR 1	
Fall 2021	**Spring 2022**
- Create three-campus project leadership team - Create individual department climate councils or committees - Hire project manager - Finalize climate survey bank	- Finalize toolkit - Meeting of three-campus project leadership team - Host launch events at each campus with PIs and department leadership teams - **Administer survey in each department (baseline)** - Provide departments with findings and meet to launch interventions - PIs from each university will participate in person in the Florida International University Bystander Training Program
YEAR 2	
Fall 2022	**Spring 2023**

- Departments implement action plans - Monthly meetings with departments and project manager	- Departments implement toolkit action plans - Meeting of three-campus project leadership team - Meeting with PIs and department leadership teams - **Administer survey in each department (midpoint)** - Provide departments with findings and meet to discuss - Provide bystander training to one or more members of participating departments
YEAR 3	
Fall 2023	**Spring 2024**
- Departments implement toolkit action plans and bystander interventions become acculturated in departments - Monthly meetings with departments and project manager	- Departments implement toolkit action plans and bystander interventions become acculturated in departments - Meeting of three-campus project leadership team - Meeting with PIs and department leadership teams - **Administer survey in each department (final)** - Provide departments with findings and meet to discuss - Final, closing department activities Intervention evaluation and final report

9. Selected references

Bronfenbrenner U. (1979). The ecology of human development: experiments by nature and design. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Carr PLMD, Gunn CP, Raj AP, Kaplan SMDMPH, Freund KMMDMPH. Recruitment, Promotion, and Retention of Women in Academic Medicine: How Institutions Are Addressing Gender Disparities. Women's Health Issues. 2016;27(3):374-381.

O'Meara, KerryAnn.; Andrew Lounder.; and Corbin M. Campbell. (2014). To Heaven or Hell: Sensemaking about Why Faculty Leave. The Journal of Higher Education 85. Routledge.603–632. (https://doi:10.1080/00221546.2014.11777342)

O'Meara, K., Bennett, J.C., & Neihaus, E. (2016). Left Unsaid: The Role of Work Expectations and Psychological Contracts in Faculty Careers and Departure. The Review of Higher Education 39(2), 269-297. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2016.0007.

Stachl, C. and Baranger, A. (2020). Sense of belonging within the graduate community of a research-focused STEM department: Quantitative assessment using a visual narrative and item response theory. PLoS ONE, 2020, 15(5): e0233431 (https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233431).