Addressing Implicit Bias at Ohio State

The Women’s Place (TWP) status reports show a slow but continual increase in the percent of women in many roles at the university over time. Unfortunately there is very little improvement in the percentages of women in top leadership positions and women of color in any position. Implicit or unconscious bias may be at the heart of diversity issues within the university and this slow progress for women. Implicit bias can be defined as attitudes we may be unaware of that affect our behaviors in ways we do not want. TWP and a number of partners focused attention on implicit bias in 2013-14 and will continue to do so through 2015.

Many units across the university are also working to increase diversity and have successfully implemented initiatives using techniques proven to help reduce implicit bias. We chose to highlight three examples below that you can replicate in whole or part in your unit or use as a catalyst to spark new ideas.

Building Community in the College of Engineering

In 2014 when Lisa Abrams was the interim director of Diversity and Outreach at the College of Engineering,* she saw the need for a better sense of community among staff and between faculty and staff in her college. She also felt that it was critical for those in the college to embrace the contributions that individual differences offer.

To address these issues, she created and administered a number of programs to increase diversity and create a favorable climate for a diverse faculty and staff. Two of these programs specifically addressed implicit bias concerns: staff “get to know you” brown bag lunches and a college-wide book discussion centering on diversity.

Staff “get to know you” brown bags were created for staff to learn more about each other on an informal basis. Each lunch included a light-hearted, icebreaker type of question for everyone to answer, which encouraged attendees to discover shared interests and start conversations.

This type of activity works to reduce biases by increasing exposure to underrepresented group members and counter-stereotypical examples among one’s colleagues. It also helps prevent stereotypic inferences by allowing people to obtain specific information about other participants who may be “different” from the norm in that unit. This happens as participants in the lunch socials get to know each other better on an individual level so they no longer see individuals as representatives of whole groups. By creating a sense of community, this program helps address the fact that those from underrepresented groups may feel like outsiders.

The college-wide book discussion centering on diversity also created a sense of community by bringing individuals from the college together to discuss the powerful book, *The New Jim Crow.* Abram’s office partnered with the Engineering Staff Advisory Committee to host the event. Dr. Hasan Kwame Jeffries of Ohio State’s History Department set the stage by providing some opening remarks about important diversity issues, addressing several of the themes presented in the book, and introducing specific questions/topics to initiate smaller table conversations.
The book discussion event provided a setting for people to learn about and discuss issues of difference. This type of activity helps reduce biases by cultivating a greater awareness of and sensitivity to group and individual differences and increasing exposure to minority group members and counter-stereotypes.

These programs were successful largely because the College of Engineering dean, David Williams, shared Abrams’ belief that the activities were needed and he has supported them by attending and funding all of them. With this support, Abrams has worked to reduce implicit bias and strengthen the college’s commitment to providing a working and learning environment in which all students and members of faculty and staff are able to realize their full potential.

*On January 1, 2015 Abrams was promoted to associate director of the Engineering Education Innovation Center.*

### Implicit Bias Awareness in the College of Medicine

At The Ohio State University College of Medicine, members of the Admissions Committee decided to examine their personal implicit biases. What happened next was historic.

Implicit bias is a particularly critical issue in health care, where there is the potential for unconscious preferences to steer decisions that affect a person’s— even populations’—health and well-being; a healthcare workforce that represents diverse backgrounds, experience and perspectives, therefore, can go a long way toward ensuring equitable care and outcomes for all patients.
To this end, Ohio State’s College of Medicine began considering the role implicit bias might play in its application and admissions process, including the possibility that committee members might unconsciously hold gender stereotypes that associate men with career roles and women with other roles.

Interpersonal interaction is an important component in becoming a medical student at Ohio State. Applicants participate in two interviews, one with a faculty member and one with a current student. From there, the candidate is presented to the Admissions Committee consisting of college faculty, community physicians, physician trainees and medical students, all of whom vote on each candidate.

Led by Dr. Quinn Capers, IV, associate professor of cardiovascular medicine and the college’s associate dean for admissions, all 150 members of the 2012-13 Admissions Committee took the Implicit Association Test (IAT, implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/education.html). In addition to examining biases related to race and sexual orientation, participants were shown photos of men and women in various domestic and professional settings, for example, feeding a child or working in an office, and asked, “Which of these photos ‘feel right’ to you?”

Following the IAT, the individual test-takers were able to review their personal results, and aggregate results were shared with the Admissions Committee and admissions leadership. The results showed that surprisingly large percentages of the men and women on the Admissions Committee displayed some implicit preference for man-professional and woman-domestic associations.

When it came time for the committee to do its work, many of its members kept their IAT experience in mind; 40-45% of the committee said they were conscious of their individual IAT results when interviewing candidates.

In the admissions cycle that followed, the College of Medicine admitted a 2013 entering class with the highest percentage of underrepresented-in-medicine minorities in its history: 20%, up from 14% in 2011. This compared to a national average of 6% and the Association of American Medical Colleges’ “benchmark of excellence” of 13%. Furthermore, women outnumbered men in the 2014 entering class—this is the first time women have outnumbered men in the 100-year history of the Ohio State University College of Medicine.

While a cause and effect relationship cannot be proven, the IAT experience overall was an important exercise in self-awareness for the committee, involving honest dialogue, self-reflection and, ultimately, a class of future physicians with greater diversity than ever before.
Diversifying Ohio State Faculty

One area in which mitigating implicit biases can have a positive and lasting impact is in faculty and staff search committees. Our biases can impede selection of the best candidates and prevent diverse candidates from being hired. Research continues to show that well intentioned reviewers behave in biased ways when evaluating materials and interviewing candidates, resulting in majority men being favored in most situations. With this awareness, The Women’s Place recognized that anti-bias search committee training combined with the university’s Discovery Themes initiative goal to hire 200 to 500 new tenured or tenure-track faculty in the Discovery Theme areas (discovery.osu.edu) create an unprecedented opportunity to substantially diversify Ohio State’s faculty and have an enormous impact on the university.

Therefore, The Women’s Place initiated a partnership with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and Gender Initiatives in STEMM to organize an ad hoc group during the summer of 2014 called the Search Committee Action Team. This group worked to create search committee training that provides best practices to mitigate committee members’ biases and increase diversity in pools, equity in search processes and diverse search outcomes. In autumn 2014, Provost Joseph Steinmetz called on the Search Committee Action Team to offer mandatory workshops for all Discovery Theme search committees—the first time such a widespread search committee diversity effort has been mandated at Ohio State.

The training materials are based on original work by each of the three offices as well as the Search Committee Action Team, implicit bias research by Ohio State’s Kirwan Institute and materials created by the university’s Office of Human Resources. The team also used outside resources, including the University of Michigan’s ADVANCE grant (STRIDE) training for search committees and the Implicit Association Test (IAT) to help participants uncover hidden preferences that may unwittingly guide their conclusions.
Association Test (IAT) (implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/) developed by Harvard researchers in Project Implicit (www.projectimplicit.net/index.html). Search committee members are strongly encouraged to take the IAT tests. In January 2015 Gender Initiatives in STEMM, along with The Women’s Place and partners from the team, brought the University of Wisconsin’s ADVANCE grant group (WISELI) to Ohio State to present their search committee training techniques and discuss how their work might be incorporated into ours.

Creating a more diverse faculty is essential to the development of new and innovative ideas and solutions and to meeting the needs of our increasingly diverse students. Keeping this in mind, the pilot search committee training program will be evaluated and adjusted regularly to improve its impact and effectiveness.


WHO: The Women’s Place, Office of Diversity and Inclusion and Gender Initiatives in STEMM

ACTION: Mandate from Provost Steinmetz: All Discovery Theme search committee members must participate in training created by the offices listed above and the ad hoc Search Committee Action Team

WHY: The training will provide best practices to mitigate committee members’ biases and increase diversity in pools, equity in search processes and diverse search outcomes, resulting in a high percentage of diverse candidates hired among the 200 to 500 Discovery Theme new tenured or tenure-track faculty

WHAT YOU CAN DO: Reduce the potential adverse impact of implicit bias in your college or unit’s hiring process by using the Discovery Themes search committee training materials for all of your faculty and staff searches. The techniques can be adjusted to suit different situations. The materials currently being used can be found at u.osu.edu/discoverythemeshires.

The training includes these six steps that any search committee can take:

1. Examine our own biases by taking the Implicit Association Test
2. Prime the pump (recruit before you need it)
3. Build an effective search committee
4. Define your search as broadly as possible
5. Thoughtfully evaluate candidates
6. Host an effective visit
MORE ACTIONS You Can Take to Reduce Implicit Bias

→ **Raise awareness of implicit bias; take IAT tests and encourage others to take them as well**

Awareness of implicit bias is a crucial starting point that may prompt individuals to seek out and implement further strategies. In our experience, most people find that becoming aware of their implicit biases helps them avoid those biases in decision making. (We mentioned IAT tests a number of times in this report, but they’re so helpful and accessible, it bears repeating.)

→ **Seek to identify and consciously acknowledge real group and individual differences**

Cultivate greater awareness of and sensitivity to group and individual differences. Attend and offer training seminars, events, and opportunities to share information that acknowledge and promote an appreciation of group differences and multi-cultural viewpoints.

→ **Routinely check thought processes and decisions for possible bias: Practice mindfulness**

Actively engage in more thoughtful, deliberative information processing and be mindful of your decision-making processes. Mindfulness training helps facilitate these efforts. When sufficient effort is exerted to limit the effects of implicit biases on judgment, attempts to consciously control implicit bias can be successful.

→ **Increase exposure to minority group members and counter-stereotypes**

Distribute stories and pictures widely that portray stereotype-busting images: posters, newsletters, annual reports, speaker series, and podcasts are examples of media you can use to distribute this message. Increased contact with counter-stereotypes—specifically, increased exposure to underrepresented group members that contradict the social stereotype—can help individuals “unlearn” the associations that underlie implicit bias.

→ **Reduce exposure to stereotypes**

Identify and discard or change environmental cues such as images and language in any signage, pamphlets, brochures, instructional manuals, background music, or any other verbal or visual communications that trigger stereotype activation and implicit bias.

→ **Take a first-person perspective of a member of a stereotyped group**

Perspective taking increases psychological closeness to “other” groups, which ameliorates automatic group-based evaluations.

→ **Practice individuation: Obtain and help others obtain specific information about people as individuals rather than as group members**

Help prevent stereotypic inferences by encouraging people to evaluate members of a group based on individual, rather than group-based, attributes. Regularly remind yourself and others that majority group members aren’t characterized by the actions of a few, unlike minority group members.

For the sources of these and other ideas, see: [www.ncsc.org/~/media/Files/PDF/Topics/Gender%20and%20Racial%20Fairness/IB_Strategies_033012.ashx](http://www.ncsc.org/~/media/Files/PDF/Topics/Gender%20and%20Racial%20Fairness/IB_Strategies_033012.ashx)

[www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3603687/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3603687/)

The Kirwan Institute’s State of the Science: Implicit Bias Review 2013 by Cheryl Staats, pages 52-63, kirwaninstitute.osu.edu
Table 1 – Status of Women at The Ohio State University
Number of women to total number of positions in category, autumn 1999 to autumn 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Change in percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>6/20</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice presidents and senior vice presidents</td>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>7/25</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior administration (assistant and associate VP’s)</td>
<td>10/40</td>
<td>32/65</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice provosts*</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>(57%) not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate provosts</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>(20%) not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant provosts</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>(38%) not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-faculty executive staff**</td>
<td>342/684</td>
<td>1243/2016</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional staff**</td>
<td>4304/6662</td>
<td>8781/12957</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans (including regional and divisional deans; vice president and dean of the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences; director of libraries; dean of graduate studies; dean of undergraduate education)</td>
<td>5/24</td>
<td>7/23</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIU heads</td>
<td>16/96</td>
<td>24/105</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Eminent Scholars***</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>3/22</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named chairs***</td>
<td>7/68</td>
<td>17/104</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named professors***</td>
<td>8/55</td>
<td>16/63</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>848/3132</td>
<td>1533/4078</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full professors</td>
<td>149/1139</td>
<td>328/1334</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professors</td>
<td>328/1087</td>
<td>499/1260</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professors</td>
<td>370/905</td>
<td>706/1484</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes two deans who also hold vice provost positions
** In autumn 2014 Wexner Medical Center personnel account for about 41% of the Non-faculty staff category and 48% of the Other professional staff category. About 74% of the Non-faculty executive staff at the Medical Center are women and about 80% of the Other professional staff are women.
*** Data in the 1999 column are from 2001; 1999 data are not available. Some chairs/professorships had not been renewed at the time of this printing and are not counted in these numbers. Ohio Eminent Scholars figures in the 2014 column are from 2013.

Table 2 – Women of Color Faculty Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>1999 (of Total Faculty)</th>
<th>2014 (of Total Faculty)</th>
<th>Change in percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>46 (1.5%)</td>
<td>67/4078 (1.6%)</td>
<td>+ 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>44 (1.4%)</td>
<td>199/4078 (4.9%)</td>
<td>+ 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9 (0.3%)</td>
<td>56/4078 (1.4%)</td>
<td>+ 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3 (0.1%)</td>
<td>3/4078 (0.1%)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>2/4078 (0.1%)</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more races</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>12/4078 (0.3%)</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>102 (3.3%)</td>
<td>339/4078 (8.3%)</td>
<td>+5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women of Color in Senior Administrative Positions

Women of color held any of the 10 Senior Vice Presidencies and Vice Presidencies and only 20% of those positions were held by white women.

Asian American, Hispanic, American Indian and Hawaiian women and women of 2 or more races held any of the 25 Senior Vice Presidencies and Vice Presidencies

The 2014 Vice Presidency statistics only show some improvement for white women and marginal improvement for black women:

Women of color (one black and one Hispanic) held any of the 21 provost positions (provost and vice, associate, and assistant provost)

Table 3 – Women in Executive and Administrative Positions

In the table below, the 1999 column shows percentages, while the 2014 column shows absolute numbers with percentages in parentheses for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Autumn 1999 % of all women in category</th>
<th>Autumn 2014 absolute number of women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive, administrative and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managerial staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>89 (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>24 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>4 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more races</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>14 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>1065 (85.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statistics and more, including 2013 data and a detailed table of information on women in senior staff and administrative positions, are on The Women’s Place website under the Data sections of the Resources tab at womensplace.osu.edu.
The Women’s Place (TWP)

Mission
The Women’s Place serves as a catalyst for institutional change to expand opportunities for women’s growth, leadership and power in an inclusive, supportive and safe university environment consistent with the goals of the Academic and Diversity Plans.

Vision
The Women’s Place embraces a vision of the university which supports all women to thrive, advance and make their full contributions within an environment characterized by equity, freedom, and dignity for all people.

Policy
TWP’s work includes policy development, for example:
• Extension of the tenure clock for birth, adoption or other issues
• Sexual harassment
• Consensual sexual relationships
• Search committee training

Culture Change
Art of Hosting Meaningful Conversations: The Women’s Place works to change university culture by sponsoring a series of trainings that have allowed several hundred faculty and staff members to learn ways of bringing equity of voice to planning and decision-making processes.

Implicit Bias and Privilege: We are bringing implicit bias awareness to the university community and are helping white male leaders understand their privilege so they can become allies in diversity efforts.

Leadership
The Women’s Place designs and facilitates 12-month leadership development programs for women faculty and staff, which focus on building networks, self awareness and difficult conversations. We also sponsor women to attend major off campus leadership institutes.
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