Resources for thinking about Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in OSG Scholars Application Review

Note: This is not a comprehensive collection of resources, but rather a place to start framing upcoming reviews and conversations. If you have additional resources that you would like to contribute to this effort, please let us know.

The Oregon Sea Grant Scholars Program remains focused on broadening participation and diversity by restructuring our recruitment and review processes to be more equitable. Our intent is to be more inclusive of applicants from various cultural, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds with unique lived experiences, skills and interests; including applicants that may have had fewer opportunities in the marine or coastal field. In support of this effort, you will find several resources below that may be helpful in this review. There are many other resources available as well, and I’d also encourage you to view the OSG Statement of Solidarity; I think there are several elements of this statement that we can apply throughout this review process.

Project Implicit®: https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/
These tests provide tools for self-reflection toward understanding the potential impacts of our preconscious/unintentional/invisible cognitive biases.

About this project: “Project Implicit is a non-profit organization and international collaboration between researchers who are interested in implicit social cognition - thoughts and feelings outside of conscious awareness and control. The goal of the organization is to educate the public about hidden biases and to provide a “virtual laboratory” for collecting data on the Internet.”

Reviewing Applicants – Research on Bias and Assumptions
http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure_3rdEd.pdf
The results from controlled research studies demonstrate that people often hold implicit or unconscious assumptions that influence their judgements. Examples range from expectations or assumptions about physical or social characteristics associated with certain job descriptions, academic, institutions, and fields of study. Recognizing biases and other influences not related to the quality of candidates can help reduce their impact on your search and review of candidates.

Reproduce Whiteness and Practical Change
Summary: Despite stated commitments to diversity, predominantly White academic institutions still have not increased racial diversity among their faculty. In this article the authors focus on one entry point for doing so—the faculty hiring process. They analyze a typical faculty hiring scenario and identify the most common practices that block the hiring of diverse faculty and protect Whiteness and offer constructive alternative practices to guide hiring committees in their work to realize the institution’s commitment to diversity.

- Considerations for reviewing CVs (page 567)
- Considerations for interviews (page 571)
Gender differences in recommendation letters for postdoctoral fellowships in geoscience


Summary: Gender disparities in the STEM fields, including the geosciences, are well documented and widely discussed. In the geosciences, there is a significant leak in the pipeline during postdoctoral years, so biases embedded in postdoctoral processes, such as biases in recommendation letters, may be deterrents to careers in geoscience for women. Here we examine the relationship between applicant gender on letter length and letter tone. Our results suggest that women are significantly less likely to receive excellent recommendation letters than their male counterparts at a critical juncture in their career.

Raising Doubt in Letters of Recommendation for Academia: Gender Differences and Their Impact


Summary: The extent of gender bias in academia continues to be an object of inquiry, and recent research has begun to examine the particular gender biases emblematic in letters of recommendations. The results of this study show that both male and female recommenders use more doubt raisers in letters of recommendations for women compared to men and that the presence of certain types of doubt raisers in letters of recommendations results in negative outcomes for both genders. Since doubt raisers are more frequent in letters for women than men, women are at a disadvantage relative to men in their applications for academic positions.

Resources shared by the OSU Search Advocate Program tailored for University hiring:

- Reviewing Applicants – Research on Bias and Assumptions - (also listed above) http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/docs/BiasBrochure_3rdEd.pdf
- Before Starting a Faculty Search, Take a Good Look at the Search Committee - https://www.chronicle.com/article/Before-Starting-a-Faculty/34954

Contacts:
Sarah Kolesar, Research and Scholars Program Lead: sarah.kolesar@oregonstate.edu
Stephanie Ichien, Research and Scholars Program Coordinator: stephanie.ichien@oregonstate.edu