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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADW</td>
<td>Academic Data Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDI</td>
<td>Associate Provost for Diversity &amp; Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>Academic Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARROWS</td>
<td>Advance, Recruit, Retain, &amp; Organize Women in STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU BEST</td>
<td>Boston University - Broadening Experiences in Scientific Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>College of Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTL</td>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL&amp;I</td>
<td>Digital Learning &amp; Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO</td>
<td>Equal Opportunity Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWISE</td>
<td>Graduate Women in Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Learning Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET</td>
<td>Metropolitan College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>Non-tenure track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTD</td>
<td>Office of Technology Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARP</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Response &amp; Prevention Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROP</td>
<td>Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Professor Jenn Morrison, University Provost and Chief Academic Officer
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T 617-353-2520 F 617-353-5889
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November 30, 2018

SEA Change Review Committee
American Association for the Advancement of Science
1200 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005

To the Members of the SEA Change Review Committee:

In furtherance of our strong commitment to create a more diverse and inclusive academic community, Boston University is pleased to submit this application for the STEM Equity Achievement (SEA) Change Institutional Bronze Award sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. SEA Change focuses on structural barrier removal for women, blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, people with disabilities, and others who are underrepresented and underserved in the STEM fields. These goals are wholly consistent with Boston University’s mission statement, which states, in part:

“We remain dedicated to our founding principles: that higher education should be accessible to all and that research, scholarship, artistic creation, and professional practice should be conducted in the service of the wider community - local and international. These principles entitle the University’s insistence on the value of diversity, in its tradition and standards of excellence, and in its dynamic engagement with the City of Boston and the world.”

Participating in the SEA Change program as a pilot institution is important to Boston University for a host of reasons – chief among them is our commitment to recruiting and retaining the best talent. We are keenly aware of the barriers that have historically prevented underrepresented groups from pursuing opportunities in the STEM fields and prompted higher dropout rates than other fields. For our part, BU is engaged in several signature, University-wide efforts – from the appointment in late 2017 of our first chief diversity officer, to the launch of ARROWS (Advance, Retain, Retain & Organize Women in STEM) and other large-scale initiatives aimed at improving the work environment for LGBTQIA employees, preventing sexual misconduct, and promoting parity in opportunities and pay for rising women professionals – designed to promote a welcoming and inclusive climate for individuals of all backgrounds.
While we are proud of these efforts and the important changes they are helping advance, we are reminded daily of the work that lies ahead. The SEA Change program is a critical part of this work. Boston University is fully committed to assessing our strengths, weaknesses, barriers, and accelerators and to building a fully inclusive environment that fosters diversity, inclusion, and equity in STEM. We appreciate your consideration of our application and encourage you to contact us with any questions you may have throughout the process.

To the best of my knowledge, all data, information, and self-assessment in this application is accurate and correct.

Regards,

Jean Morrison
University Provost and Chief Academic Officer
2) DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTITUTION

Established in 1839 and located in Boston, Massachusetts, Boston University (BU) is comprised of 17 Schools and Colleges housing 209 academic departments, all spread across the University’s Charles River and Medical Campuses. Classified under the “Doctoral Universities: Highest Research Activity (R1)” category of the Carnegie Classification framework, the University had 3,502 full-time academic faculty, 15,238 graduate students, and 16,792 undergraduate students during the Fall 2017 semester, the most recent period for which data is available.

The University’s STEM departments (as listed below) offer minors, BA, BS, MA, MS, MEng, and PhD degrees, and furthermore, over 30 other degree types are granted by the University as well. Table 2.1 below contains the lists and current sizes of the University’s STEM departments comprising the scope of this SEA Change Bronze Award application. All references to BU’s STEM departments for the purposes of this application will refer to the departments below. These departments are in the University’s College of Arts & Sciences (CAS) and College of Engineering (ENG), and these two Colleges will be the focus of the evaluation and proposed actions in this SEA Change Bronze Award application.

Table 2.1 - List and sizes of Boston University’s STEM departments as of Fall 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURAL &amp; FORMAL SCIENCES</th>
<th>No. of Faculty</th>
<th>No. of Graduate students</th>
<th>No. of Undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth &amp; Environment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGINEERING</th>
<th>No. of Faculty</th>
<th>No. of Graduate students</th>
<th>No. of Undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL SCIENCES</th>
<th>No. of Faculty</th>
<th>No. of Graduate students</th>
<th>No. of Undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological &amp; Brain Sciences</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Many undergraduate programs, especially in the natural sciences, are interdisciplinary and are jointly taught by multiple departments, and because of this, students are generally identified by programs and not by departments. As such, in creating this table certain programs were "assigned" to some departments and not others, leading to departments' undergraduate numbers being imprecise and some seeming very large or very small (i.e. Biology, Earth & Environment, and Physics.)
3) SELF-ASSESSMENT

Over the course of preparing this application, representatives from many of the University’s stakeholding sectors contributed to the University’s self-assessment efforts. The self-assessment was led by a formal Oversight Committee and supplemented by an informal group of additional contributors and reviewers. The members of these self-assessment teams are listed in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 below:

Table 3.1 - Members of the BU SEA Change Oversight Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linette DeCarie</td>
<td>Asst Vice President, Analytical Services &amp; Institutional Research</td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Ginzburg</td>
<td>Associate General Counsel</td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Kleinman</td>
<td>Associate Provost for Graduate Affairs Professor of Sociology</td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Lutchen</td>
<td>Dean, College of Engineering Professor of Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Sandell</td>
<td>Senior Associate Provost</td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Sclaroff</td>
<td>Dean ad interim, College of Arts and Sciences Professor of Computer Science</td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Tucker</td>
<td>Vice President, Human Resources</td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Waters</td>
<td>Vice President and Associate Provost for Research</td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Williams</td>
<td>Associate Provost for Diversity &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Wong</td>
<td>Inaugural Director, ARROWS, Office of the Provost Professor of Biomedical Engineering Professor of Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>Oversight Committee SEA Change Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Anderson</td>
<td>Special Projects Coordinator, College of Engineering Undergraduate Programs Office</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Barman</td>
<td>Associate Dean of the Graduate School of Arts &amp; Sciences Professor of Sociology</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Bernier</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary of the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Bizup</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies, CAS</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Brossman</td>
<td>Director, LERNET</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Brousseau</td>
<td>Digital Creative Director, Marketing &amp; Communications Interactive Design Dept.</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Campbell</td>
<td>Assoc. Director Institutional Research</td>
<td>Data Collection Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Celenza</td>
<td>Director, Program in Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Biology Associate Professor of Biology</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziba Cranmer</td>
<td>Director, BU Spark</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol Eisenberg</td>
<td>Senior Associate Dean for Academic Programs, College of Engineering Professor of Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Freeman</td>
<td>Assistant Dean of Outreach and Diversity, College of Engineering</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Jarvi</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Student Academic Life, CAS</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Loizeaux</td>
<td>Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs Professor of English</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Marois</td>
<td>Director of Faculty Actions, Office of the Provost</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine McGuire</td>
<td>Vice President and Associate Provost for Enrollment &amp; Student Administration</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oversight Committee members were invited to serve on the committee by the University Provost. Members were selected based on their current roles at Boston University and how their roles intersect with the self-assessment questions. Each member gave direct input into the application. Contributors and reviewers were either recommended by Oversight Committee members or solicited for input based off their positions in relevant University offices. The demographic breakdown of the Oversight Committee is found in Figure 3.1 below:

![Demographic breakdown of BU SEA Change Oversight Committee](image)

**Figure 3.1** - Demographic breakdown of BU SEA Change Oversight Committee

Below is a breakdown of the person hours contributed by each type of person involved with the University's SEA Change application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Preparers</td>
<td>2 people</td>
<td>75 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight Committee</td>
<td>10 people</td>
<td>5 hours each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>3 people</td>
<td>12 hours each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributors</td>
<td>20 people</td>
<td>2 hours each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewers</td>
<td>20 people</td>
<td>2 hours each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Going forward, the Oversight Committee will continue to meet, and additional members may be added (e.g. the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs). Additionally, as listed in Section 11, implementation subcommittees will be formed to carry out the work listed in this application’s SMART Action Plan. Implementation team members will be nominated by the Oversight Committee. Compensation and recognition will be discussed and implemented at this time.

For this application, we have only examined data on the gender and race/ethnicity of Boston University’s students, faculty, and community members and were unable to include data regarding persons with disabilities or LGBTQIA+ identities. Data on race/ethnicity and gender is collected by the University in response to federal reporting requirements, whereas there are no such requirements or policies in place for the systematic collection and reporting of student LGBTQIA+ identities and disabilities. Nonetheless, policies and methods for collecting student demographic data regarding LGBTQIA+ identities and disabilities are currently under discussion by the University. Relatedly, our institution is hoping to leverage the work of our newly convened Task Force on LGBTQIA+ Faculty and Staff to determine how to evaluate LGBTQIA+ representation in our faculty and staff members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 3.1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Task:</strong> Create recommendations for improving LGBTQIA+ inclusion across the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Timeline:</strong> February - May 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) INSTITUTIONAL COMPOSITION

4.1) Institutional composition | Faculty

A disaggregated snapshot of the demographics of all BU’s faculty, its STEM faculty, and its faculty broken down by broad STEM discipline is found below in Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1.

Table 4.1 - A demographic breakdown by amounts and percentages comparing all BU faculty, STEM faculty, and STEM faculty by general discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>All Faculty</th>
<th>All STEM</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, Male</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Female</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Male</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Female</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino, Male</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino, Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Male</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Male</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Male</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3502</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage breakdown:

- All Faculty: 43% | 31% | 56% | 6% | 55% | 49%
- All STEM: 46% | 32% | 56% | 6% | 50% | 48%
- Natural Sciences: 50% | 64% | 56% | 6% | 54% | 49%
- Engineering: 56% | 66% | 56% | 6% | 52% | 49%
- Social Sciences: 50% | 34% | 44% | 6% | 45% | 51%
Additionally, Tables 4.2 and 4.3 and Figure 4.2 show the disaggregated snapshot of faculty further broken down by their professorial rank along with their general STEM discipline. In this data, non-tenure track (NTT) faculty include non-tenure track assistant professors, non-tenure track associate professors, non-tenure track professors, adjunct professors, instructors, lecturers, Professors of the Practice, and professors emeritus.

Only data on faculty gender and race/ethnicity was collected in this self-assessment, and the future collection of additional types of demographic data is discussed in Section 3.
Table 4.2 - Demographic breakdown by percentages of Full Professors and Associate Professors across all BU and general STEM disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>All BU</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>ASSE</td>
<td>FULL</td>
<td>ASSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Male</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Female</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Male</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Female</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino, Male</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino, Female</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Male</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Female</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Male</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Female</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Male</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Female</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 - Demographic breakdown by percentages of Assistant Professors and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty across all BU and general STEM disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>All BU</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASST</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>ASST</td>
<td>NTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Male</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Female</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Male</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Female</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino, Male</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino, Female</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Male</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Female</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Female</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Male</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Female</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2 - Pie charts visually displaying the demographic breakdowns of BU faculty by rank and general STEM disciplines. (Note: The percentage values of these pie graphs can be found in Tables 4.2 and 4.3)

From the data presented in these tables and figures, it is clear that the racial and ethnic diversity of BU’s faculty is primarily White across the University as a whole, across STEM as a whole, across each broad STEM discipline, and at every faculty rank. In none of these cases do the percentage of White
faculty fall below 50%. This stands in contrast to the relatively racial and ethnic diversity of the BU undergraduate (and to a lesser extent graduate) student body (see Section 4.4).

4.2) Institutional composition | Administrators

The disaggregated demographic breakdown of the University’s 4,157 administrative staff members (excluding clerical, facilities, security, and service staff members) is found in Table 4.3 and Figure 4.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>All Administrators</th>
<th>All Administrators %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, Male</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Female</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Male</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Female</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latino, Male</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latino, Female</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American, Black, Male</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American, Black, Female</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native, Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native, Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Male</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Female</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Male</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Female</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Male</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Female</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our application, we have chosen to focus our SMART Action Plan, and correspondingly much of our evaluation efforts, on the University’s faculty. We consider the University’s staff to be out of the scope of this current SEA Change application.
4.3) Institutional composition | Graduate students

Tables 4.5, 4.6 and Figures 4.4 and 4.5 below show a disaggregated snapshot of the demographics of all BU’s graduate students (both Masters and PhD), its STEM graduate students overall, and its graduate students broken down by broad STEM discipline.

**Table 4.5** - Demographic breakdown by amounts and percentages of BU PhD students as a whole and across broad STEM disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>All PhD Students</th>
<th>All STEM</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, Male</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Female</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino, Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino, Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Male</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Female</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Male</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Female</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Female</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.6** - Demographic breakdown by amounts and percentages of BU Masters students as a whole and across broad STEM disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>All Masters</th>
<th>All STEM</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, Male</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Female</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Male</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Female</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino, Male</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino, Female</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Male</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Female</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Male</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Female</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Male</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Female</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Male</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Female</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Male</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5180</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.4 - Pie charts visually displaying demographic breakdown of all BU PhD students, STEM PhD students, and PhD students by general STEM discipline (Note: The percentage values of these pie graphs can be found in Table 4.5)
Overall, STEM graduate students at Boston University, at both the Masters and PhD levels, exhibit about the same ethnic and racial diversity as students in non-STEM graduate programs, with a few notable exceptions.

Firstly, the percentage of White PhD students of all genders is 43%, while the percentage of White STEM PhD students of all genders is only 35%. At the Masters level, this difference is observed again with percentages at 33% and 22%, respectively. At the same time, the percentage of international PhD students overall is 36% but jumps to 47% when examining STEM PhDs. At the Masters level, these numbers spike further from 29% to 64%, for overall and STEM Masters students, respectively. Simply put,
there are a lesser percentage of White graduate students in STEM than in the overall student body, and there are a larger percentage of international graduate students in STEM than in the student body.

Beyond White and international students, STEM and non-STEM graduate students at the PhD level show similar levels of racial and ethnic diversity; unfortunately, these levels are very low. In no cases do any underrepresented minority groups, neither at the PhD or Masters level, surpass more than 5% of the student population; not in overall graduate students, not in overall STEM students, and not in any of the general STEM disciplines.

Regarding gender differences in graduate student demographics, there does not appear to be any large gender disparities when examining minority students across either all students, all STEM students, or STEM students by general discipline. Large disparities do come into focus though when examining White and international students, where, broadly put, the percentages of males surpasses females in STEM and its general disciplines at all levels, except in the cases of White female PhD students and international female Masters students studying the social sciences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Action 1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Task: Graduate pipeline - building the PhD applicant pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Timeline: February 2019 - May 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4) Institutional composition | Undergraduate students

Table 4.7 and Figure 4.6 below show a disaggregated snapshot of the demographics of all BU's undergraduate students, its STEM undergraduate students overall, and its STEM undergraduate students broken down by broad field.
Table 4.7 - A demographic breakdown by amounts and percentages comparing all BU undergraduates, STEM undergraduates, and undergraduates by general STEM discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>All Undergrads</th>
<th>All STEM</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, Male</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Female</td>
<td>4511</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Male</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Female</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latin, Male</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latin, Female</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Male</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black, Female</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Male</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native, Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Reported, Female</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Male</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien, Female</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Male</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing, Female</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>6360</td>
<td>3249</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>2347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16792</td>
<td>6340</td>
<td>3249</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>2347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.6 - Pie charts visually displaying demographic breakdown of all BU undergraduates, STEM undergraduates, and undergraduates by general STEM discipline (Note: The percentage values of these pie graphs can be found in Table 4.7)

The consideration of additional factors such as undeclared vs. declared students, full-time vs. part-time students, and students who have students transferred from 4-year or 2-year institutions, were not included in this self-assessment as we considered them out of the scope of this current SEA Change application.

Across the University as a whole, STEM as a whole, and the general STEM disciplines, the undergraduate student body is diverse across racial and ethnic categories, and generally well-balanced across male and female genders. The only smaller exceptions worth noting are Engineering where men
are more proportionally represented than women and the Social Sciences where women are more proportionally represented than men.
5) KEY TRANSITION POINTS

5.1 Key transition points | Faculty

a) Recruitment

When a position becomes available in any of the University’s STEM departments, the Dean of the department’s School/College submits to the Provost’s Office a proposal for a faculty search committee and its composing members. In their search proposals, Deans must address strategic objectives, teaching needs, describe how the search will foster our institutional goal of adding diversity to the faculty, describe the composition of the search committee in terms of rank, gender, race and ethnicity, provide advertising text that goes beyond the “boiler plate” to include diversity indicator language, and describe advertising and outreach efforts that will help deepen and strengthen the pool in terms of underrepresented faculty for the discipline.

After a faculty search committee is established, both the committee chair and the committee members are provided tailored training by the Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion (APDI), which is strongly encouraged. (In the fall of 2018, multiple training sessions, each two-and-a-half hours in length, were provided.) The process by which candidates are selected for interviews, interviewed, and selected varies by department. The definition of excellence and promise, as related to the faculty search, varies with specific fields. The APDI training sessions provide templates of example rubrics and strongly encourages that rubrics are agreed upon before any candidate evaluation is conducted.

All faculty positions are automatically posted to the Boston University HR job board, Inside Higher Ed, and Higher Ed Jobs Online. Individual search committees also advertise in discipline-specific venues or venues for race/ethnicity or gender affinity groups. The search committees manage the outreach efforts, vetting, assessment, and decision-making, specific to their search, with the expectation that they do so in the spirit of the University’s commitment to diversity and inclusion.

A confidential, elective self-identification survey is emailed to all faculty applicants. Responses are collected centrally and can be reported in aggregate by search. The demographic pools of each search are distributed to search chairs, Deans, and faculty actions staff on a monthly basis, or upon request, to help gauge outreach and assess whether additional efforts are needed to enrich the pools. Data on the applicants, interviewed candidates, candidates offered a job, and candidates hired is compiled by the Provost’s Office and reported to the Board of Trustees. This detailed analysis of diversity metrics for every search is used in the annual performance evaluation of the Schools/Colleges’ Deans.

Our faculty recruitment process and requirements are reviewed every year before a solicitation goes out from the Provost to the Deans for search proposals. The process review includes the Provost, Senior Associate Provost, the APDI, and Budget & Planning, as well as the Provost’s Director of Faculty Actions. The APDI is in close communication with our Office of General Counsel when we make changes that touch on areas that have legal considerations.

In addition to the efforts described above, other ways in which the University works to enhance faculty diversity and the inclusivity of the faculty search process include:

- Flexibility on faculty hiring, provided by the Provost, which allows Deans to leverage upcoming vacancies (e.g. known future retirements) to hire additional faculty who would add diversity and which bridges funds needed until the vacancy occurs. In place informally since approximately 2012, this process is now being described and used more formally.
● A mechanism for the creation of postdoctoral positions for junior partners of faculty members from underrepresented groups by sharing the costs between the corresponding Dean and the Provost.

● Commitments by the Provost (in place since 2015) to discuss progress on diversity metrics annually at our University Council, the faculty governance forum.

● The development of designated administrative positions focused on diversity efforts in almost all the University’s Schools and Colleges; some Schools (e.g. the College of Engineering) were pioneers in this effort, but most Schools and Colleges now have these positions.

● Leading by example: The Provost has made concerted efforts in all executive leadership searches to work with the search advisory committees to identify and recruit outstanding leaders from underrepresented groups. Although these deanships do not touch directly on STEM fields, we have recruited African-American or Latinx deans in 3 out of the last 4 dean searches, and in the fourth, we were able to recruit the first female Dean of the School of Business.

**ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 1.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○ Task: Discussion of postdoc-to-faculty pilot program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Timeline: January - May 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Hiring

The process of negotiation after a job offer is made varies by School/College and by department and is carried out on a case-by-case basis. However, negotiated terms are subject to review by the Divisional Associate Dean of Faculty, Faculty Actions staff, and the School/College’s Dean who have historically compared packages offered to faculty candidates in the same area(s).

At this time, we do not have data in a format that would allow us to easily provide a disaggregated snapshot from the past 3 years of new hires across the institution and in the STEM departments. Creating this disaggregated snapshot is included in our SMART Action Plan (see Section 11 or excerpt below.)

**ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 1.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○ Task: Data Collection: New faculty hire data from past 3 years, comparing STEM to overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Timeline: April - May 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding other components of hiring packages such as spousal/partner hiring, content and value of startup packages, starting and periodic adjustments to salaries, and start-up and continuing support for research, we also do not currently analyze these data centrally, and Deans are responsible for considering all of these factors for all hires and continuing faculty. The University recently signed the Boston Women’s Workforce Council’s “100% Talent: The Boston Women’s Compact”, committing ourselves to understanding the root causes of the wage gap, closing the gap, and then evaluating success. Additionally, expectations about partner hires are a big challenge for us. Although we have had success in creating and sponsoring non-tenure track positions for partners, if a tenure track faculty position is what is desired, we only have flexibility in exceptional cases. Most cases are not exceptional, despite the expectations of the faculty member who seeks a position for their partner, whether at the time of hire or as part of a later retention bid.
Regarding processes and policies to prevent salary and start-up inequities, Deans are responsible for ensuring that start-up packages are appropriate for the needs of each candidate. A simple examination of funds committed would not recognize the very real differences in need, even among members of the same department. An illustrating example of this are the very different needs of a theoretical physicist from an experimentalist.

Mechanisms and policies to ensure faculty are supported when they start their position vary by department and by College/School. A number of STEM departments, but not all, include one course release as part of the standard startup package for incoming early-career faculty. In some departments where the standard course load is one four-credit course per semester, course release is not included in the package; instead, the faculty member teaches one seminar in place of a course during the first year. While there is not an official policy, service expectations are reduced for tenure-track assistant professors and entering faculty are informed about this at the new faculty orientation.

- **Action 1.2)**
  - Task: Documentation and assessment of faculty recruitment process
  - Timeline: May 2019

- **Action 1.3)**
  - Task: Assessment of faculty hiring process
  - Timeline: September 2019 - July 2020
  - Notes: Using the data and assessments collected in Action 1.1 and Action 1.2, we will re-assess resources needed for faculty hiring process refinement, targeted to be implemented in Fall 2020 faculty searches
c) Promotion & tenure

When conducting reviews for tenure and promotion, the College/School-internal timelines vary and criteria differ by field. All candidates are evaluated in the three general areas of teaching, research, and service. Our Faculty Handbook states the overall standards for the University, and a recent, May 2018 revision made the primacy of excellence in scholarship/creative work explicit for the faculty and those who evaluate them, e.g., “The general criteria for awarding Tenure are a strong record of a) teaching, b) scholarly and/or creative work, and c) University and professional service. While the relative weight accorded these areas of professorial activity may vary by School to School, a national reputation for excellence in scholarly and/or creative work is required.” Promotion to Full Professor cases are due to the Provost’s Office by mid-Fall semester and will receive a final decision from the Provost and President by mid-Spring semester. Promotion to Associate Professor cases are due to the Provost’s Office by early Spring semester and will receive a final decision from the Provost and President by the end of the Spring semester.

There is a formal process for appealing/challenging promotion and tenure decisions, and this process is described in great detail in the Faculty Handbook’s “Tenure and Promotion on the Charles River Campus” section. The number of appeals varies from year to year but generally ranges from 0 to 3 appeals across all disciplines, not just STEM. In 2018 there was one tenure appeal to the President, and it was successful.

We do not currently have the data to create a disaggregated snapshot of promotion and tenure decisions for the last 3 years, but this data can be compiled by the Provost’s Office in the future and examined for any discrepancies.

The annual faculty merit process includes salary equity analysis and adjustments. The Provost’s Office provides Deans with two salary analyses each year for each department in their School/College. The analyses show faculty base salary as a function of years since final degree and against years in rank. The data are identified by rank and gender. We have so few underrepresented (URM) faculty that these are not separately identified, but the graphed data is linked to faculty names, so deans are well aware of how their faculty salaries are situated, relative to one another, at the departmental level. Deans are asked to use this information to inform recommendations to the Provost for salary increases from a separate “equity” pool in each annual raise cycle. These recommendations are reviewed by the Senior Associate Provost, and ultimately approved by the Provost and President. A faculty member who is concerned about their salary is asked to first discuss the situation with their Department Chair, and if they are unsatisfied with the explanation or resolution, they are asked to discuss with the Dean. If the Dean supports the request for a salary adjustment, they must first try to address it within the equity pool just described. If that is impossible, they may request additional funds from the Provost, although this is a rare occurrence because we disburse all available salary each year through the merit raise and equity adjustment pools.

There are an array of University-wide early career development professorships to provide continual support for research beyond starting offers. Two of these, the Provost’s Career Development Professorships, specifically fund entry-level female faculty in STEM fields. In addition, there are early career professorships restricted by School or College, including one in ENG and one in CAS. Candidates for university-wide early career development professorships are nominated by Deans and selected by the Provost. The process for within-school professorships includes an internal nomination process and final selection by the Dean.
ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)

- **Action 2.1)**
  - **Task:** Tenure and Promotion Informational Workshop for CAS Faculty
  - **Timeline:** Spring 2019 - Fall 2019

- **Action 2.2)**
  - **Task:** Tenure and Promotion Workshop
  - **Timeline:** Early Spring 2019 and Early Spring 2020

ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)

- **Action 2.3)**
  - **Task:** Informational Workshop on Policies and Process for Promotion
  - **Timeline:** Spring or Fall 2019

- **Action 2.4)**
  - **Task:** Promotion Workshop
  - **Timeline:** Fall 2019 and Fall 2020

d) Retention
The University does collect data on our faculty “leavers”, however that data is currently not in a format that allows us to readily provide a disaggregated snapshot of faculty “leavers” in STEM compared to all institutional faculty. Moving forward, the Provost’s Office will be able to compile the data to create this snapshot and we will examine it for our future work.

Similarly, the Provost’s Office tracks where “leavers” go after resigning and distributes an exit survey to all resigning and retiring professorial faculty. We were unable have this data assessment ready for this application, but plan on doing so moving forward.

Faculty retention efforts and generating matching offers are handled on a case-by-case basis by the Deans, working in collaboration with the Provost. Among many factors that help determine whether a retention offer is made are:

- Has the faculty member been successful at Boston University? (Are they demonstrably strong in research/creative work? Are they an excellent teacher? Have they provided valuable service?)
- What do we see as their future role, if we retain them against an outside offer?
- Does the investment of resources make sense for us strategically, given the objectives of the school or college or the University as a whole?
- Does the department and Dean support the retention as a high priority and are they willing to back up that commitment by sharing the costs of the retention with the Provost?
- Are there elements about the outside opportunity that we are simply unable to counter, such as the need to move close to aging parents?
- What is the quality of the institution and department that have provided the external offer?

Taking into consideration the productivity of the faculty member and the circumstances prompting their potential departure, BU can deploy a variety of approaches – from identifying different opportunities within
the institution that may be of interest, to devoting considerable resources through a matching offer -- aimed at retaining the member.
6) CAREER & PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

6.1) Career & professional development | Faculty

a) Faculty appraisal/review

Tenured and tenure-track faculty submit faculty annual reports during the spring semester. Review of the annual report is conducted by the Department Chair and feedback in the form of a written report is given to the faculty member, after which they can meet to discuss with their Department Chair.

In the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS), each unit is asked to establish an open, transparent, and fair means of evaluating the relative merits of its individual faculty members. All CAS STEM departments involve a faculty committee in the merit review, either appointed by the Chair or elected by the faculty, to assist with evaluation. This approach seeks to avoid potential bias, allow the development of departmental norms about judging relative merit, and provide feedback to each faculty member about their evaluation. CAS policy requires that the faculty should be fully informed of the merit review process used by the unit. A detailed memo that outlines CAS merit review policy and review criteria is publicly available in the CAS Faculty & Staff Handbook’s “Faculty Merit Exercises” section.

In the College of Engineering (ENG), a day-long annual merit review is held and attended by all Chairs and Deans. At this review, each faculty member is evaluated based on the metrics they are held accountable for. For research faculty, this includes research (publications, grants, Ph.D. students supervised with extramural funds), teaching, and internal and professional service. For non-research faculty, we primarily judge teaching and service. Faculty within a given rank are compared across the College and receive a merit score that translates to the eventual raise. The group tries to maintain common expectations within rank across all programs. Junior faculty must meet with their Chair to review a written summary of their merit evaluation. Senior faculty are invited, but not required, to do the same.

b) Advising & mentoring

There are many different institutional efforts in place to train and support faculty as they learn to become mentors and advisors to students. The Office of the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs has established an Advising Network program which hosts regular brown bag lunch events and an annual academic advising symposium. These events are open to all BU community members involved in advising students. Previous events are archived on the program’s website, along with materials from the events, including videos. Additionally, a Subcommittee on Assessing Advising (a subcommittee of the Advising Network) has been created to broadly assess the success of the undergraduate advising program across Schools/Colleges. The subcommittee scans existing assessment information and advising processes across the Schools/Colleges to identify patterns and areas of strength and weakness; it also identifies necessary resources to enhance the effectiveness of undergraduate advising. Boston University now has three sets of data from the NSSE Advising Module, and these results are shared with Advising Network members and used to identify strengths and weaknesses.

All CAS faculty are provided with a “CAS Undergraduate Advising Guide” which discusses students’ degree requirements, academic opportunities and specialized programs on campus for students, and campus offices which can act as resources for the advisor themselves.

All new ENG faculty are invited to attend a training for advisors, but it is not mandatory. These trainings provide a grounding on advising fundamentals and on the College’s degree requirements for students. Advisors who are unable to attend these workshops can receive individual trainings, if desired.
Each School/College has its own formal opportunities in place to allow new faculty to communicate with and gain insight from senior faculty.

The College of Arts & Sciences offers two formal mentoring programs for faculty. One, aimed at assistant professors, is designed to help them become well-integrated into Boston University and develop and follow successful career paths. All assistant professors are required to participate. The other is a voluntary program, aimed at associate professors and designed to help them continue their professional development, assume their roles as senior faculty, and move in a timely way toward promotion to the rank of Professor. These programs, the mentoring policies and standards of CAS, and the framework and expectations within which each individual departmental program operates can all be found in detail in the CAS Faculty & Staff Handbook’s "Mentoring" section. Workshops from the Mentoring Program for Assistant Professors are also archived online.

The College of Engineering has mentoring programs for assistant professors that vary by department, but all have a common theme of assigning at least 1 to 2 mentors per junior faculty member who are instructed to meet with them formally at least once per year and informally as needed. Mentors (and Chairs) are asked to encourage faculty to review their drafts of grant proposals prior to submission as well.

BU community members across the various student and faculty levels are given information on how to access mentors across the institution. The Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP) website helps to connect faculty mentors with undergraduate researchers. Graduate students find mentors through various mechanisms depending on their program. (For example, some programs have first-year seminars in which faculty members give presentations describing their laboratory research.) Pre-tenure/early career faculty have mentor programs that vary by department. In the past, there have been some training grants that have assessed mentor-mentee relationships, but this has not been applied universally across the University.

c) Pedagogical support

Boston University’s Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) partners with faculty to cultivate teaching that is inclusive, centered on student learning, and guided by research. They offer individualized consultations, workshops, seminars, and institutes designed to promoted critical reflection and experimentation in teaching, including the purposeful use of technologies. In addition to programs offered by the CTL, the Digital Learning & Innovation (DL&I) office offers other trainings for effective pedagogy and provides funding opportunities for course improvement. Both the CTL and DL&I websites provide videos of example successful collaborations between their offices and faculty. The Program Learning Outcomes Assessment is another tool for programs to ask questions and gather evidence about their effectiveness. All degree programs across the University take part in this assessment process.

Additionally, both CAS and ENG have their own mechanisms for pedagogical support. In CAS, individual departments and programs have internal procedures for observing faculty members’ teaching and for peer review of teaching and teaching materials. In ENG, either the Department Chair (or the Chair’s designee who is know to be a superb teacher) will attend a lecture or two for the first class taught by a junior faculty member and will provide advice and council on ways to improve both via techniques and content.

Several online learning platforms are also available to supplement faculty interaction with classes virtually including Blackboard, Zoom, and other platforms. The DL&I office, under the leadership of the Associate Provost for Digital Learning, offers consulting, training, funding, and co-development support to aid Boston University leadership, faculty, and graduate students with modern teaching, learning, and
technology. They cultivate innovative new experiments and aid in developing new residential, online, and hybrid programs. CAS Information Technology also has a dedicated educational technologist whose responsibility is to help CAS faculty, departments, and programs effectively integrate instructional technology into their courses.

Efforts to advocate for the use of evidence-based, effective pedagogies are encouraged and supported through the DL&I and CTL which have already done work to support active learning and techniques such as ‘flipping the classroom’ at the University. The University is also developing classroom infrastructure to accommodate the needs of active-learning classes.

Several awards for effective teaching are given out each year at the University, College, and Departmental levels. At the departmental and college levels, students nominate the awardees. For the University-level awards (the Metcalf Cup and Prize and Metcalf Awards), the award committee over the course of the year solicits and reviews supporting materials from the candidates: short essays on their approaches to teaching, course syllabi, student evaluations, graded assignments, samples of student feedback, documents to support learning, other interactive and/or web-based course materials, and letters of recommendation from the candidates’ Department Chairs. The members of the committee visit the classes of the finalists and, in the Spring, present their recommendations to the University President.

Criteria used to select winners of the Metcalf Cup and Prize and the Metcalf Awards include: ‘Excellence in teaching in the context of a research institution’, ‘Challenge and ambition’, ‘Engagement’, and ‘Thoughtful evaluation of student work.’ Other awards for teaching are the Provost’s Scholar-Teacher Award and the Gitner Award for Innovation in Teaching with Technology.

A ‘Degree Advice Report’ dashboard is available to all faculty advisors which indicates any advisee’s remaining credits required and the status of the advisees in the Academic Data Warehouse (ADW). ADW trainings are available weekly for faculty and staff, and information from the ADW is regularly used at all levels of the institution to monitor student progress and identify patterns for multiple student populations.

Every semester, ENG reviews all its undergraduate and graduate students’ academic progress. Undergraduates who fall below a 2.0 GPA are formally put on academic probation, with periodic mandatory follow-up meetings during the subsequent semester with a counselor. Students are expected to return to good standing by the end of the next semester. A similar process is in place for graduate students, but GPA trigger is 3.0. These policies are described in full detail online.

As a self-evaluation measure, the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs convened a Task Force on Evaluating Teaching in the Summer of 2017 to devise recommendations for academic units on assessing teaching. Much of this work includes a redesign and standardization of student course evaluation forms. This work is ongoing and will result in the release of the report and actions to address the task force recommendations.

**ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)**

- **Action 2.5**
  - **Task:** Pilot grant pitches with feedback for STEM assistant professors
  - **Timeline:** Spring 2019 (target for pilot)

**6.2) Career & professional development | Graduate students**

33
a) Professional development training

The CTL offers trainings for graduate student teaching assistants to help them hone their teaching abilities. All graduate student teaching assistants in CAS and ENG take a required course in teaching organized at the departmental level.

Furthermore, each department and program has an external advisory board, and graduate student training is one of the major components that is evaluated externally. In addition, all of the University’s departments and programs have completed or will soon complete an Academic Program Review (APR) in which the above issues are assessed. While we are not able to share details of each program, this data exists and can be used to improve the effectiveness of the training.

Boston University also has a NIH Broadening Experiences in Scientific Training (BU BEST) program open to all Boston University biomedical trainees, doctoral students and postdocs on both campuses. Their events, geared towards preparing trainees for a variety of career paths to make the most of their PhD, include career development opportunities on communication and presentation skills. GWISE (Graduate Women in Science and Engineering) - a student group open to all BU graduate students in STEM - also conducts many professional development workshops. There are also several training grants on campus that provide students with training.

Finally, a Postdoctoral Associate for Professional Development has recently been hired who will be working to develop additional graduate student professional development trainings and workshops. A committee was also recently established and charged with developing a set of teaching competency standards for graduate students. While these will likely be voluntary at the department/School/College level, we will encourage units to require that their students who do teaching meet them.

6.3) Career & professional development | Undergraduates

a) Training

All undergraduates are provided with many opportunities to participate in academic research, most notably through the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP). Undergraduates can apply for a UROP award (offered 3 times per year) providing a student stipend to conduct research with a faculty sponsor. Around 60% of applications are funded each year. Additionally, all undergraduates are able to conduct research directly through a faculty member either through research position listings maintained by UROP or outside the UROP programmatic structure entirely. Both CAS and ENG also have other programs to support undergraduate research. These opportunities all correspond to the AAC&U “Undergraduate Research” High Impact Practice (HIP).

Peer-teaching opportunities are available through the Learning Assistants Program to improve undergraduate education by training students in teaching methods and practices. LAs (Learning Assistants) are knowledgeable and experienced peer educators, and LAs can enhance their own learning abilities through pedagogical training from the BU Wheelock College of Education & Human Development. LAs are positioned in various undergraduate courses in the Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Environment, Mechanical Engineering, and Physics departments, and the Neuroscience program.

BU Study Abroad provides specific programs for students from each of the STEM departments except for Astronomy. These specifically-designed experiences correspond to the “Diversity/Global Learning” HIP.

Finally, CAS and ENG require all of their respective students to participate in FY 101 and EK 100, respectively, which are first-year seminars corresponding to the “First-Year Seminars and Experiences”
HIP. All seniors in the College of Engineering are required to create a Capstone Thesis or team-based Capstone Project, corresponding to the “Capstone Courses and Projects” HIP.

The University is host to many different student organizations and communities dedicated to the inclusion of women, students of color, and LGBTQ+ students in STEM. Some student groups are chapters of larger national organizations (e.g. Girls Who Code, National Society of Black Engineers, Out in STEM, Society of Asian Scientists and Engineers, Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers, Society of Women Engineers) and some are more local to the University (e.g. Undergraduate Women in Science and Engineering, Women in Computer Science.) Additionally, BU offers two residential living community options, WISE@Warren and WISE-UP, for female undergraduates studying STEM. These groups are all listed on the Office of the Provost ARROWS (Advance, Recruit, Retain & Organize Women in STEM) website.

Effectiveness of undergraduate training and enrichment is assessed by the Undergraduate Council and the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs. The Undergraduate Council works to improve the quality of the undergraduate experience at BU by collaborating across Schools and Colleges to assure the highest academic standards and promote a vibrant culture and intellectual community. The Undergraduate Council receives regular reports from the Dean of Students, the BU library, UROP, and the Kilachand Honors College, and they also consult with other groups as needed. Student Affairs conducts annual quantitative and qualitative outcomes assessment for Athletics, the Center for Career Development, the Community Service Center, the Howard Thurman Center for Common Ground, Residence Life, and the BU Arts Initiative to ensure that offerings meet student needs and to identify the need for additional programming.

There was a recent overhaul in the undergraduate general education across the entire University. Launched in Fall 2018, the **BU Hub** is Boston University’s university-wide general education program that emphasizes working across disciplines to prepare for a complex and diverse world. Briefly, students can explore a variety of courses and innovative learning experiences while developing six essential capacities and fulfilling Hub requirements. The six essential capacities are: Philosophical, Aesthetic, and Historical Interpretation; Scientific and Social Inquiry; Quantitative Reasoning; Diversity, Civic Engagement, and Global Citizenship; Communication; and Intellectual Toolkit.

b) Transitions

To support the transition from secondary to postsecondary education, BU administered the BCSSE (Before College Survey of Student Engagement) for the first time in Summer 2018 to collect data on incoming students to assist in advising and to support the transition of students to the first year of college. The data includes information about high school preparation and expectations for the first year of college that can help identify students at risk.

Several different programs are also available to help support high school students who will soon be transitioning to postsecondary education, including the Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math Science, and Yes-Prep IMPACT programs. In addition, there are several high school programs that expose high school students to research (e.g. Research in Science & Engineering (RISE), Summer Pathways for Girls) and middle school students to STEM (e.g. U-Design). (We note that while RISE offers a research internship to students, the students must be able to afford a substantial (~$8000) tuition for the program.) An example of adjustments in programming is the Summer Pathways Program: team building, curfews and homework assignments were added to discourage cliquish behavior and promote an inclusive environment. Acceptance is based on an online application and two teacher recommendations.
7) FLEXIBILITY & CAREER BREAKS

7.1) Flexibility and career breaks | Faculty

a) Parental & adoption leave

Three kinds of parental leave, each with different eligibilities and benefits, are available to faculty: Childbirth Leave, Parental Leave, and Primary Caregiver Workload Reduction. Childbirth Leave is six weeks of paid leave made available to the birth mother for pregnancy, childbirth, and recovery. Parental Leave is twelve weeks of unpaid leave for any parent for the pregnancy, birth, or adoption of a child or the assumption of new foster care. Primary Caregiver Workload Reduction is paid, full teaching and service relief for one semester or half relief for two semesters for childcare after birth, adoption, or foster care for either parent.

All tenure-track faculty members who take a Paid Absence for Childbirth and/or Workload Reduction because they become the primary caregiver of a new child will be granted an automatic one-year deferral of the tenure review deadline. Faculty may also opt not to receive the automatic one-year deferral, even if they take a childbirth leave and/or workload reduction.

The data required to provide disaggregated snapshots of both the usage rates of and retention rates after parental/adoption leave is not collected centrally by the University but rather by each School/College. As such, these disaggregated snapshots are unable to be provided at this time, but will be created in the future and examined for any discrepancies across demographic groups.

Compliant with the Family and Medical Leave Act, BU provides faculty and staff with “Family Illness/Medical Condition” leave which is twelve weeks of unpaid leave in the event of the serious medical condition of a spouse, child, or parent.

Nine lactation rooms are available for faculty, staff, and students on Boston University’s Charles River Campus. Of these nine available rooms, five are available for any faculty, staff, or students, while the remaining four are for those affiliated with specific colleges or offices. Additionally, faculty typically have their own private offices which can serve as lactation rooms. Two of these rooms are equipped with a sink and a small refrigerator.

b) Flexible work

There are no central, institutional policies to accommodate flexible working schedules.

c) Childcare

Boston University offers two early childhood education program options at the Charles River Campus. The tuition at the Boston University Children’s Center is lower than the market rate due to the University covering rent, utilities, and insurance for the Center. There is limited space at two of Boston University’s childcare centers that are available on a first-come first-serve basis. In addition, limited spots are available for childcare on snow days when Boston University is open and the Boston and Brookline public schools are closed.

Beyond the policies and resources described above, there is no central support mechanisms such as stipends or childcare support for conferences, though individual deans might choose to offer it.
d) Effect on success

In order to support the success of faculty who avail themselves of BU’s child-related benefits, the Family Resources Center offers various resources and services, including educational programs co-sponsored with the Faculty/Staff Assistance Office.

Data on the usage rates of the above child-related programs and data on tenure and promotion timelines and success rates are collected and analyzed by various different University Schools/Colleges/offices, and as such are not currently able to easily analyzed together. This can be done in the future and examined for any insights.

e) Evaluation

There is currently no evaluation mechanisms in place to determine if there are discrepancies based on race, ethnicity, or gender in how policies are applied and whether the programs discussed above are beneficial/effective, aside from some anecdotal evidence from particularly content or discontent individuals.

7.2) Flexibility & career breaks | Graduate students

a) Parental & adoption leave

In June 2014, the University adopted a university-wide childbirth and adoption accommodation policy for PhD students which is listed online and in the CAS (though not ENG) graduate student handbook. This policy for full-time or certified full-time PhD students in good academic standing provides for extensions for academic coursework and other requirements to the primary caregiver of an infant or adopted child. It also provides for a continuation of stipend support for funded students during the accommodation period. The period of accommodation is 60 days and must end no later than the final day of the semester immediately following the semester in which the child is born or the newly adopted child is placed. If both parents are eligible PhD students at Boston University, the accommodation is available to both, but the periods of accommodation may not overlap.

The student will be excused from all course requirements during the period of accommodation, including assignments and exams. The student should make arrangements with each instructor to complete any assignments or exams missed. Other requirements outside of formal coursework, such as qualifying or comprehensive examinations, should be rescheduled as appropriate to provide reasonable time for preparation and completion. A student holding an appointment for which a stipend is paid, whether service or non-service, will continue to receive the stipend during the period of accommodation. If the student is serving or was to serve in a teaching role during the semester of the accommodation, the student will be relieved of any responsibilities related to the course(s) during the period of accommodation. At the program’s discretion, the student may be relieved of all course responsibilities for the semester. If the student is serving or was to serve as a research assistant on a funded project during the period of the accommodation, the student will be relieved of any responsibilities directly related to the project during the period of accommodation.

A student may elect a shorter period of accommodation, at the sole discretion of the student, and should inform the relevant Department Chair (or program director) in writing. The student will remain registered as a full-time or certified full-time student during the period of accommodation.

Under this policy, PhD students are not able to “stop the clock” on their work towards a degree, as the length of a multiyear stipend commitment made at the time of admission and the total time allowed to obtain the degree will generally not be extended by the period of accommodation.
This childbirth and adoption accommodation policy is a university-wide policy for all PhD students; therefore, there should be no implementation discrepancies for students based on race, ethnicity, gender, or any other similar characteristics. Nonetheless, internal assessments can still be conducted to confirm that there are no discrepancies, to determine how effective this policy has been so far, and to study how the policy can be further enhanced. Because these accommodations are made at the departmental/program level and overseen by each department/program’s respective College, these internal assessments would need to be conducted by the respective Colleges (i.e. the Associate Deans of CAS and ENG).

7.3) Flexibility & career breaks | Undergraduates

a) Scheduling
Degree programs out of CAS and ENG do not offer evening and/or online courses. BU’s Metropolitan College (MET) offers evening and online courses for students to provide flexibility, but the scope of the STEM degree programs offered is limited.

Students with long-term family caring responsibilities are able to submit Leave of Absence requests to their Colleges which will allow them return to the University when they are ready. The College of Engineering is not aware of many students requiring accommodation for short-term family caring responsibilities and correspondingly there is no policy or program in place for this situation.

All undergraduate students within BU’s College of Arts & Sciences and College of Engineering must declare a major before registering for their junior year.

b) Credits
BU does not actively collaborate with other 2- or 4-year institutions to provide pathways for undergraduate students to transfer to BU. Students who transfer to BU from other institutions are responsible for working with the College they are transferring into in order to determine which of their existing credits are transferable.

Applications from students wishing to transfer to BU are not handled by CAS, ENG, or by the program of study or department they wish to enroll in. Rather, these applications are handled identically to admissions applications from high school seniors, meaning that their application is reviewed by the University’s central Admissions office, and each application is evaluated to determine if the student meets the university’s student academic profile.

c) Evaluation
Neither CAS nor ENG conduct any long-term evaluation of whether any of the policies above which are currently implemented contain discrepancies based on race, ethnicity or gender. The Vice President and Associate Provost for Enrollment & Student Administration, in collaboration with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, convenes a retention and student success committee that evaluates the retention and success data of all undergraduates, identifying areas of concern and whether any populations are overrepresented in those who do not persist at the University. The University Service Center tracks students on leave, ensuring appropriate advising as the students are exiting, and periodic follow-up regarding the process for returning to the University and completing their studies.
8) INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES FOR DIVERSITY

8.1) Institutional policies for diversity | Policies for addressing discrimination

a) Policy review

Boston University’s Executive Director of Equal Opportunity, who is also the University’s Title IX Coordinator, is responsible for developing and reviewing policies related to equity, diversity, and inclusion. In addition, BU has an Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion, described in Section 8.5.

BU’s Equal Opportunity Office serves as a resource for individual employees and managers who have questions or concerns about unlawful discrimination or harassment, accommodation of employees with disabilities, accommodation of religious practices, and other equal opportunity and affirmative action-related matters. They also serve as a resource for students who have concerns about unlawful discrimination and harassment. They advise administrative and academic departments regarding their Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action obligations.

The office provides formal training for managers and employees on sexual harassment, discrimination, and other EO topics. This training is also offered to departments and other groups upon request.

b) Outcome

The policies and procedures described above are posted on the University’s Policies website. In addition, some policies are shared with new employees upon hiring and with students at orientation. This year, the University has rolled out new mandatory Sexual Misconduct/Title IX training for all faculty, staff and students, which provides information about the Title IX/Sexual Misconduct Policy. The University has tested student awareness about that policy with a campus-wide climate survey in 2015; the University will conduct another climate survey in 2019.

Procedures for investigating and adjudicating alleged discrimination and harassment are described in detail in the relevant documents. Depending on the status of the accused, the Equal Opportunity Office (employees) or the Dean of Students’ Judicial Affairs office (students) investigates allegations. The same offices are responsible for documenting the findings and outcomes of those investigations. Consequences for violations vary by the status of the accused (employee v. student) and the investigators’ particular findings about the alleged discrimination or harassment.

The policies and procedures are reviewed from time to time, based on changes to the relevant law. The persons involved in those reviews vary depending on the depth of the review, but the University’s general counsel’s office is generally involved in any review to ensure compliance with law.

c) Purpose

The University’s commitment to diversity included in the Boston University Mission Statement (see Section 8.2.a). Additionally, the final section of Boston University’s 2015 Strategic Plan, titled “Mapping Our Progress and Our Future”, has a subsection titled “Diversity: Enriching the tapestry of our Community” which restates our commitment to increasing the share of our student body who are from underrepresented groups and who are Pell Grant recipients, and “to creating an inclusive and diverse faculty to educate and mentor the next generation.”

d) Engagement
The BU Board of Trustees and President set the vision and strategic plans for the University, which as described above, includes a push towards greater diversity and inclusivity. Through the work of the Provost’s Office and other offices, the University’s senior administration set and evaluate University-wide policies which are hosted on the University’s Policies website. As described throughout Sections 5 and 6, Deans and Department Chairs are responsible for setting and evaluating policies affecting the students, faculty, and staff in their respective Schools/Colleges.

e) Awareness
In order to effectively communicate policies across different institutional communities, all policies described above are centrally located on the Boston University Policies website. In addition, faculty, staff, and students are trained on the University’s Title IX/Sexual Misconduct policies. The University disseminates pamphlets with information about that policy and makes them available in key offices around campus. The University also maintains a Safety page on its website, which provides information on what to do if students or someone students know is affected by sexual misconduct.

f) Discrepancies
The University’s Title IX office has not formally analyzed its data to determine if there have been discrepancies in policy implementations or disproportionate filings of complaints from underrepresented groups, but the office has not noticed any trends in those respects.

8.2) Institutional policies for diversity | Requirements with policy drivers & legal requirements as design parameters

a) Mission
A commitment to diversity is included, both explicitly and in spirit, in Boston University’s mission statement, as seen in part below:

“We remain dedicated to our founding principles: that higher education should be accessible to all and that research, scholarship, artistic creation, and professional practice should be conducted in the service of the wider community—local and international. These principles endure in the University’s insistence on the value of diversity, in its tradition and standards of excellence, and in its dynamic engagement with the City of Boston and the world.”

b) Means of achieving mission: race- and gender-neutral and conscious strategies
We are committed to attaining a diverse community. Some of the ways we achieve this are by (1) partnering with community groups to actively recruit from the multicultural communities surrounding Boston, (2) welcoming diverse applicants and those who value diversity who have an interest in serving a university community with diverse needs, backgrounds, ethnicities and abilities, and (3) creating a learning environment for staff and faculty that includes the critical role of diversity and inclusion. All of our programs in which we recruit talent - from hiring faculty and staff, to admitting graduate students and undergraduates, we strive to put into place processes that combat known unconscious biases. This includes coming up with rubrics in advance of assessing applicants for positions when hiring and when promoting.

8.3) Institutional policies for diversity | Legal Compliance Reviews
a) Disability services

Boston University is committed to providing equal and integrated access for individuals with disabilities to all the academic, social, cultural, and recreational programs it offers. This commitment is consistent with legal requirements, including Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act as Amended (ADAAA) of 2008, and embodies the University’s historic determination to ensure the inclusion of all members of its communities.

The goal of Boston University’s Office of Disability Services is to provide services and support to ensure that students can access and participate in the opportunities available at Boston University.

Boston University has made Responsive Framework available to its web designers. Websites that use the Responsive Framework are compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and WCAG 2.0 A/AA (international guidelines that are considered best practices for accessible technology.)

b) Title IX

To ensure compliance with Title IX, Boston University has a University Title IX Coordinator as well as deputy coordinators for key offices and within all Schools/Colleges. As described in Section 8.1.e, the institution’s policies and services related to Title IX are publicly available on the University’s policies website.

8.4) Institutional policies for diversity | Anti-discrimination policy reviews

a) Process

Briefly, BU’s University policy must 1) have broad application throughout the University; 2) help ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations, promote operational efficiencies, enhance the University’s mission, or reduces institutional risks; 3) mandate actions or constraints, contain specific procedures for compliance, and articulate desired outcomes. In addition to University-wide policies, schools, colleges and departments may have policies or policies specific to their particular area. These should be clearly written, approved and communicated through appropriate channels, and consistent with (though they may be more restrictive than) University Policies. Proposals for additions and modifications to Boston University’s Academic and Administrative Policies are subject to careful review at many levels. Successful policy proposals should provide a compelling rationale that meets the highest standard of clarity and institutional necessity and is in alignment with the University’s and individual school and college strategic plans. Both academic and administrative University Policies go through the University’s development and approval process to ensure that a broad range of stakeholders are consulted. When necessary to comply with laws or regulations, the President or Provost may approve issuance by senior leadership of University-wide policies that have not been considered by the University Council, Administrative Council, Council of Deans or Faculty Council, if the requirements of a University Policy are inconsistent with federal, state or local laws, follow the law.

b) Affirmative action plans

Compliant Affirmative Action Plans are developed annually by the Equal Opportunity Office. Currently, the EOO reviews the completed plans with Human Resources to inform their staff recruitment efforts. As part of the Plan, the Provost’s Office prepares the Charles River Campus faculty data, and the Medical School, Dental School and School of Public Health prepare their own faculty data. They use the data they generate to inform faculty recruitment efforts. We are working toward sharing staff data with
individual departments in a meaningful way to allow department heads to more fully understand their recruitment goals. All of the data in the plans is disassociated from individual searches.

c) Coordination

Many positions and offices exist within the University to review and coordinate diversity initiatives across the institution, but because of how large Boston University is as a whole, coordination among these many positions and offices can sometimes be challenging. Beyond the Associate Provost for Diversity & Inclusion (see Section 8.5.d), there is the CAS Diversity and Inclusion Committee, the ENG Associate Dean of Outreach & Diversity, the CAS Office of STEM Outreach and Diversity (Section 10), the Provost Office’s Advance, Recruit, Retain & Organize Women in STEM program (Section 8.5.d), and the Provost Office’s recently-appointed Faculty Fellows for Diversity & Inclusion in PhD Education, among others.

8.5) Institutional policies for diversity | Diversity in leadership

a) Makeup

Boston University’s governing board is its University Board of Trustees, made up of 5 officers and 37 additional members. The disaggregated description of the Board of Trustees is found below in Figure 8.1.

![Figure 8.1 - A demographic breakdown by percentages of the Boston University Board of Trustees](image)

b) Appointment process

As a private research university, the institution is not governed by a state board of regents, but instead by the Trustees of Boston University according to published Charter, Statutes, and By-Laws. The Boston University Board of Trustees is self-sustaining. Three trustees are ex officio board members: the University President; the Chair of the University Faculty Council; and the Chair of the advisory Board of Overseers. The Board of Trustees selects the University President. The Vice Presidents and Provosts are appointed by the Corporation upon the recommendation of the President.

c) Reports

The Boston University Board of Trustees does not currently receive a diversity and inclusion report at its annual board meeting. However, in September 2014, the Board of Trustees ratified a crucial statement: “We strive to create environments for learning, working, and living that are enriched by racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity.” Less than one year later, the University-wide Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusion was established to ensure that BU faculty reflect the rich diversity of our society and our student body by suggesting specific ways of increasing BU’s proportion of underrepresented minority faculty.
The task force’s final report, published in May 2016, presented five major recommendations, including: 1) the appointments of a University-wide Associate Provost for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion and equivalent administrative officers in each of BU’s Schools and Colleges; 2) the creation of Implementation and Standing Committees focused on faculty diversity and inclusion; 3) the development of strategic plans for diversity and inclusion across all BU Schools and Colleges; 4) public and regular communication about diversity and inclusion at BU; and 5) the creation of doctoral-faculty pathways for underrepresented minorities. The report also provides recommendations for recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty and for fostering an inclusive environment, and concludes with a statement on student perspectives and the impact of the Task Force’s recommendations on student education at BU.

In addition to the University-wide report mentioned above, BU’s College of Arts & Sciences (CAS), the University’s largest College which also contains all physical and social science departments, convened the CAS Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Planning Committee in February 2017. This Committee published their final report in December 2017 and made their report publicly available. The report’s main sections are: 1) Strategies and Structures for Change, 2) Developing our Faculty through Strategic Hiring Practices, 3) Building an Inclusive Climate for All, 4) Enhancing Diversity and Inclusion in CAS Curriculum, Pedagogies, and Campus Experiences, and 5) Expanding Pipeline Programs that Invest in Underrepresented Scholars, where each section contains 10, 17, 12, 9, and 10 relevant recommendations, respectively. The College of Engineering in its Strategic Plan published in 2016 has identified a major goal ‘to instill in faculty the mindset and provide the training to achieve diversified faculty and student populations as a critical requirement and strategy for improving excellence.’

d) Dedicated office/administrator

The aforementioned Task Force on Faculty Diversity and Inclusion considered the most effective organizational structures for achieving diversity-related objectives, and ultimately called for the appointments of appropriate administrative officers at the University-level and in each of BU’s Schools and Colleges. In October 2017, BU appointed its inaugural Associate Provost for Diversity & Inclusion (APDI), a role which reports directly to the University Provost. The APDI recently conducted a series of Thematic Listening Sessions and a ‘Research on Tap: Broadening Participation in STEM’ event. These listening sessions focused on identifying ways to support faculty and staff from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups, LGBTQIA+ faculty and staff, creating inclusive pedagogies, supporting International Students, supporting people with disabilities, and other related focuses. In addition, the Office of the Provost’s ARROWS (Advance, Recruit, Retain & Organize Women in STEM) program, established in 2014, supports broad efforts advancing and supporting women in STEM at all career levels at BU.
9) INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE & CULTURE

9.1) Institutional climate & culture | Education, encouragement, and open discussion

a) Programs and training
Various workshops and seminars have been held across the University to raise awareness of issues related to diversity and inclusion and addressing isolation and reducing discrimination. For example, the BU School of Public Health has a regularly occurring Diversity and Inclusion Seminar Series.

To ensure that undergraduate students experience and participate in diversity-enhancing programs, the newly rolled-out BU Hub program (see Section 6.3.a), requires all undergraduates to take a certain number of courses qualified as teaching on “Diversity, Civic Engagement, and Global Citizenship”. In the second of a 4-year implementation, there are 430 courses currently approved in this capacity.

The diversity trainings described above are not required elements of workplace orientation and training for faculty and staff, but the University’s newly revamped sexual harassment (see Section 9.3) is required of all employees. This newly revamped training is designed by EVERFI and was chosen because it updates content on an ongoing basis in response to changes in law and best practices, with a strong focus on using the latest research-based prevention information.

Campus-wide programs related to diversity, inclusion, harassment and/or discrimination do exist and are described in Sections 6.3 and 9.3.

b) Identification and solutions
As described in Section 9.3, students and faculty have customized, distinct training modules in sexual misconduct, including sexual assault. We do not have formal training in unconscious bias, but there have been events on campus to highlight these issues. The Office of Diversity and Inclusion in the Provost Office has programming in these areas.

ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)

- **Action 3.5**
  - **Task:** Create directory of all recent work that has been done / is being done to address Impostor Syndrome across Boston University
  - **Timeline:** Spring 2019 - Fall 2019

- **Action 3.6**
  - **Task:** Pilot a student-led campaign highlighting stories of Impostor Syndrome to further gauge interest on this topic among student body, most active student groups
  - **Timeline:** Spring 2019

- **Action 3.7**
  - **Task:** If Action 3.6 demonstrates student or faculty interest in further Impostor Syndrome work, begin discussing idea of larger, potentially University-wide campaign
  - **Timeline:** Fall 2019

c) Discussion
As described in Section 9.3, Boston University has engaged in efforts for faculty to be trained in carrying out difficult conversations related to sexual assault through mandatory online training. In addition, the Equal Opportunity Office has been conducting live training programs tailored for different departments on campus that encourages discussion.

### ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)

- **Action 3.2)**
  - **Task:** Convene LGBTQIA+ student groups to review recommendations made by Task Force
  - **Timeline:** September or October 2019

---

### 9.2) Institutional climate & culture | Institutional climate

**a) Climate survey**

See subsection 9.2.b) below.

**b) Population**

The most recent climate survey, the [2013 Faculty Climate Survey](#), was administered to all full-time tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track faculty at the Charles River and Medical campuses. The report is available online to the BU community in aggregate, but Institutional Research (IR) may be contacted to provide School/College-specific results. While we do not currently have this data, the IR department has the capacity to disaggregate the data by race/ethnicity and gender.

In 2015, undergraduate and graduate students were invited to participate in the University’s [Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey](#) whose final results were made available online and which led to the changes in the University’s sexual misconduct policies.

**c) Action**

Results of the 2013 Faculty Climate Survey are posted online and are Kerberos-protected (i.e. only accessible by BU community members.) The results of the 2013 climate survey are reported in comparison to a 2007/08 Faculty Climate Survey. For both the 2007/08 and 2013 climate surveys, the results were widely shared with deans, faculty and faculty groups (e.g. Faculty Council, Task Forces), although we do not have a compilation of the ways in which our individual Schools/Colleges used the climate survey results.

As mentioned above, the results from the 2015 Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey were made publicly available online.

### 9.3) Institutional climate & culture | Sexual harassment and assault

**a) Policies**

Boston University has a zero-tolerance policy on sexual harassment.

**b) Training**
In the Fall of 2018, the University launched mandatory online sexual misconduct prevention training for all faculty, staff, grad students, and undergrads. BU first instituted mandatory online training for faculty and staff in 2014, and made a similar training optional for students. Two primary goals of the online training are to 1) provide information necessary for everyone in the community to fully understand what constitutes sexual misconduct and to ensure they are aware of the resources, policies, and procedures available to them, and 2) to demonstrate and reaffirm BU’s steadfast commitment to creating a respectful environment in which to learn and work.

The online trainings are overseen by the University’s Equal Opportunity Office in collaboration with the Student Health Services and Human Resources. The new effort is designed to educate faculty, staff, and students about how to recognize sexual misconduct, how to have an appropriate conversation with anyone who reports sexual misconduct, how to help direct survivors of sexual misconduct to the proper University or off-campus resources, and how to report the incident to proper authorities, like one of multiple deputy coordinators across campus.

ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)

- Action 3.4)
  - Task: Develop language on University’s Sexual Misconduct policies to be placed in students’ syllabi
  - Timeline: January - December 2019

The online training consists of separate modules for undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty and staff. The platform we have chosen sends out reminder emails to those who haven’t completed the training, and keeps track of who has yet to finish the training.

Last April, the Association of American Universities published a report on sexual assault and sexual misconduct on US campuses. It included several specific actions and programs that BU has undertaken to prevent and address sexual assault and misconduct on campus. For instance, the University’s Sexual Assault Response & Prevention Center provides sexual violence prevention programming and other trainings for students and BU community members, among them Step Up Step In BU, a course that teaches bystander intervention and prevention. The College of Arts & Sciences offers the course FY101 for first-year students, which contains programming on healthy consent and communication.

ACTION PLAN excerpt (see Section 11 for full details)

- Action 3.3)
  - Task: Participate in the AAU 2019 Survey on Sexual Assault and Misconduct
  - Timeline: Text

c) Action

The new mandatory training is ongoing and therefore has not been assessed yet. The Provost Office and Title IX/Equal Opportunity Office will be assessing the results.

d) Sexual assault center

Many centers and offices are in place to provide services to victims and those accused of sexual assault. Most notably is the Sexual Assault Response & Prevention Center (SARP), which provides
confidential care, support, and advocacy for victims of sexual assault, while simultaneously promoting awareness and prevention programs on campus. The center’s primary objective is to provide superior clinical response, as well as awareness and prevention programming, to the Boston University community. SARP’s clinical focus is on providing appropriate treatment to students who have experienced sexual or interpersonal violence, as well as, or in addition to, physical or emotional trauma. SARP’s prevention efforts include bystander intervention education and programming that raises awareness of all types of sexual misconduct, dating violence, stalking, and harassment.

9.4) Institutional climate & culture | Faculty workload

a) Service/committees
Tenured and tenure-track faculty service in the form of committees and focused task forces exist at Boston University at departmental, college, and University levels. Boston University currently does not have a formal policy to address committee workload/overload. However, faculty annual reports include service to the University and external service, which includes total number of hours served for each activity. The manner in which the committee service data is submitted for individual faculty annual reports does not currently lend itself to easy data analysis.

Rotation in committee membership is decided by the Chair at the departmental level; Deans at the School/College level, and the Provost and/or President at the University level. In addition, there are interdisciplinary programs or Centers that have service committees. Committees and Tasks Forces in the Office of the Provost are listed [here](#).

b) Workload allocation
The University does have a workload allocation model, partially. Research and teaching typically comprises 80-90% of the workload allocation, and the remaining 10-20% for service, advising, and administration. The CAS Faculty & Staff Handbook details CAS’s “Teaching and Research Workload” policy for tenured/tenure-track faculty with further details on course buy-out. ENG likewise publishes guidelines on “Allocation of Faculty Time.”

The University through the Office of the Provost honors advising through Undergraduate Academic Advising Awards. CAS recognizes undergraduate advising through student-nominated awards. ENG recognizes general service through a Faculty Service Award. UROP has been honoring outstanding research mentors since 2014.

Some level of service (both internal and external) is expected for tenure and promotion, and is considered in merit reviews, as described in Section 5.1.c.

There is currently not a formal process for monitoring workload for bias.

9.5) Institutional climate & culture | Role models and diversity

a) Equity in institutional events
Diversity data for invited speakers and other BU STEM-related events is currently not formally collected and we do not have formal reports with statistics for event programming from each BU STEM department or Center. It is possible to collect data from past events to raise awareness in this area and to
develop best practices to ensure diversity and inclusion on campus. This would have a large impact in departments that have low numbers of underrepresented groups in the faculty.

The University’s Marketing & Communications office has begun working with the Associate Provost for Diversity & Inclusion to begin to be more inclusive and representative in their coverage, which the APDI believes they have done. As an example, they created an "Opening Doors" series, which highlights people who are opening doors for others, most of whom are people of color. Additionally, many more features in Bostonia and BU Today (Marketing & Communication-produced magazine publications) feature people from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups and also people who are members of the LGBTQIA community.

The ARROWS program highlights accomplishments of women in STEM on their website and has an annual lecture inviting a high-profile accomplished woman in STEM. GWISE has two luncheons per year that highlights accomplishments of accomplished women in different areas of STEM.

The University Lecture is the highest honor bestowed to Boston University faculty engaged in outstanding research. In 2017, the Provost instituted a new selection process designed to seek the input of a broader-cross section of the University community with the aim of encouraging the nomination and selection of candidates who reflect BU’s commitment to diversity and inclusion. To this end, the last year that a female STEM faculty member was the University Lecturer was in 1993, until 2018, when the University Lecturer was a woman in STEM who is also a member and leader (co-chairing the newly convened LGBTQIA+ Task Force) of BU’s LGBTQIA+ community.

The College of Engineering Distinguished Lecture (inaugurated in 2008 and renamed the Charles DeLisi Distinguished Award and Lecture in 2015) had its first female faculty recipient in 2017. The Office of Technology Development (OTD) awarded the Innovator of the Year Award (inaugurated in 2010) to a female innovator. In addition, this year for the first time, ARROWS collaborated with OTD at their flagship event to have an electronic poster showcasing female faculty members who are innovators (see Section 10.)

Other underrepresented groups at Boston University are at the stage of community building. Certainly more attention could be given to highlighting accomplishments of individuals from historically marginalized groups, and recent efforts have been made to address this. For example, in April 2018, BU Today (the University’s daily email news bulletin sent to the entire BU community) published “Where I’m Coming From: Underrepresented voices in science offer unique perspectives” consisting of videos and the accompanying stories of three members of BU’s STEM community who are an African-American male faculty member, a female faculty member, and deaf graduate student.

The Associate Provost of Diversity & Inclusion has been conducting listening tours at the University of underrepresented groups (see Section 8.5.d) and intends to hire a Director of Programs, responsible for creating institutional programming focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Starting in Fall of 2017, the Associate Provost of Graduate Affairs and the Dean of Students have been convening gatherings of graduate students of underrepresented groups with the aim of community building.
Most, if not all, the events described above are advertised through the BU calendar, BU Today, various mailing-lists, posters on campus, and social media.

b) Publicity
Section 9.5.a above
Boston University’s Office of Technology Development (OTD) has set one of its goals for its 2019 fiscal year to study and understand how the OTD can measure, reflect, and act on encouraging diversity among innovators in the BU community.

According to the OTD, there are 1,066 unique individuals who have disclosed an idea to its office, and of those, it was estimated by the OTD staff that 275 (25.8%) of those individuals were female. Because of this, the office’s staff has formulated the following questions which they are working to answer:

- How do we normalize the number of female individuals disclosing ideas against the total population of faculty and students?
- How does this data change when we look at actual patents filed and patents issue?
- How does this data changed when we look at licensed technologies, startups, industry sponsored research and commercial activities?
- After analyzing the above data what actions can we take at BU to address the gender gap and improve the opportunities for the female researchers?

Since 2011, the College of Engineering has engaged over 24,000 middle and high school youth around the U.S. through a targeted outreach program called the Technology Innovation Scholars Program (TISP). Each year, TISP trains approximately 60 ENG undergraduate students to lead hands-on, interactive lessons with K-12 students, to get them excited about engineering by participating in design challenges and interacting with undergraduate engineering students. Recently, the college received a National Science Foundation (NSF) EAGER grant to begin developing a national research agenda to understand the impact of undergraduate ambassador outreach programs, like TISP, on the STEM pipeline.

The College of Arts and Sciences recently launched its Office of STEM Outreach and Diversity to providing a directory of BU STEM initiatives, give information about ways faculty and graduate students can get involved with existing BU programs, and help faculty and graduate students with National Science Foundation proposals that require Broader Impacts.

The ARROWS program recently established an annual “New Faculty Welcome Reception” to welcome new tenure-track female STEM faculty in all STEM departments across BU. During this year’s event, the new faculty members were able to meet each other as well as senior faculty, representatives from CAS administration, and the leaders of various graduate and undergraduate student organizations supporting women in STEM at BU.
The following action plan is a result of findings from our self-assessment, provided as a narrative in Sections 1 - 10. We focus our efforts primarily on faculty and as with any action plan, it is a living document. Thus, we will continually re-assess as we learn from each action.

We plan to focus our work on Faculty Hiring (Section 5), Career Advancement (Sections 5 and 6), and Institutional Climate (Section 9). We have chosen to focus on faculty hiring because our numbers of underrepresented STEM faculty could be significantly improved. We also note that the national pool numbers are low; thus we are committed to efforts that will add trainees to the pipeline. We have chosen to focus on Career Advancement because of findings from our assessment. In addition, our (private) results from an internal faculty climate survey comparing 2013 to 2006 and a recent ARROWS faculty survey, we feel that these areas require the most attention.

In addition to the efforts internal to Boston University listed in the Action Tables below, we are involved in various partnerships locally, regionally, and nationally. We will leverage these efforts in our overall action plan.

- **Graduate Education Focus, National:** CIRTL- AGEP: (Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning - Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate): Funded by the National Science Foundation, Iowa State University, Boston University, Cornell University, Howard University, Michigan State University, Northwestern University, University of Buffalo, University of Georgia, University of Maryland College Park, and University of Texas at Arlington are building a “networked improvement community” focused on improving dissertator experiences with the goal of creating a more inclusive environment for graduate students.

- **Building Community, Local and Regional:** The Women of Color in the Academy organization was launched in 2017 with their first conference held at Northeastern University. While this community is not focused solely on STEM, but community building has clear benefits for the STEM community. For example, BU is represented on the steering committee of Women of Color in the Academy.

**Boston University SEA Change Bronze Objectives**

1) Assure Boston University’s quality of output over the long term by attracting the best talent to BU, regardless of gender, age, race, and other differentiating characteristics.
2) Develop processes to help increase the numbers of BU STEM women and underrepresented minority tenured and tenure-track faculty, ideally at all levels (assistant, associate, full)
3) Develop processes to help increase the number of BU STEM women and underrepresented minority in leadership positions
4) Ensure that everyone contributes to the maximum productivity of Boston University

The project will use the following metrics to track progress against targets:

- Work toward increasing the faculty candidate pool to match the nationwide statistics (noting field-specific data) in terms of gender and race and ethnicity.
- Count the number of women and underrepresented minority faculty hired – at all levels
(assistant, associate and full professors).

- Compare data in terms of time for promotion to full professor before and after policies are put into place.
- Adherence and compliance to policies of existing faculty: want full acceptance and engagement of male and female STEM faculty

**Project scope (Phase 1)**

The topics indicated below and set initiatives will focus our program to improve and develop positive programs and groups.

Topics that are in the scope:
- Recruiting and retaining Women in STEM and underrepresented minority STEM faculty to BU.
- Advancing women STEM faculty and underrepresented minority STEM faculty in leadership positions at BU.
- Instituting leadership programs to support the above two bullets.

**Governance Plan:**

The Boston University SEA Change Oversight Committee will meet once per year to review the progress and revise the action plan.

The detailed SMART plan with tasks are given in the tables below with estimated time frame. Each action plan will be subject to an annual review timed to assess progress and to refine each process. In addition, monthly check-in assessments will be carried out to identify problematic tasks and to refine and re-adjust the roadmaps.
## ACTION AREA 1: Faculty Hiring Process

**Goal:** Assess data and current processes

### Action 1.1
- **Task:** Data Collection: New faculty hire data from past 3 years, comparing STEM to overall
- **Owner:** Assistant Vice President, Analytical Services & Institutional Research
- **Sponsor/Approver:** Department Chairs and ENG and CAS Deans
- **Timeline:** April - May 2019
- **Metrics:** Evaluate if this information identifies problem areas
- **Notes:** Goal is to gain a disaggregated snapshot, which currently we are unable to do regarding faculty hires

### Action 1.2
- **Task:** Documentation and assessment of faculty recruitment process
- **Owner:** Assistant Vice President, Analytical Services & Institutional Research and to-be-named implementation subcommittee on faculty hiring
- **Sponsor/Approver:** Department Chairs; ENG and CAS Deans; Search committee chairs
- **Timeline:** May 2019
- **Metrics:** This action is information gathering, which will inform other actions
- **Notes:**
  - Conduct inventory of current documentation methods of search process and faculty hiring data
  - Document process held annually by Provost Cabinet that assesses faculty hiring process
  - Encourage departments to document changes (if any) in recruitment methods and to compare against faculty hire data collected
    - For example, some recent searches had multiple faculty candidates in a one-day symposium. We do not have data as to whether this is an effective hiring strategy.

### Action 1.3
- **Task:** Assessment of faculty hiring process
- **Owner:** Provost Cabinet
- **Sponsor/Approver:** Provost
- **Timeline:** September 2019 - July 2020
- **Metrics:** Success will be measured by determining if new policies are generated based on findings from the data collected
- **Notes:**
  - This process is currently carried out annually
  - What would be new is that we would use data and assessment collected in Action 1.1 and Action 1.2 to re-assess resources needed for faculty hiring process refinement, targeted to be implemented in Fall 2020 faculty searches

## Goal: Building the Pipeline

### Action 1.4
- **Task:** Graduate pipeline - building the PhD applicant pool
- **Owner:** Graduate Affairs Faculty Fellow for Diversity and Inclusion
- **Sponsor/Approver:** Associate Provost for Graduate Affairs
- **Timeline:** February 2019 - May 2020
- **Metrics:** Success will be measured by monitoring applicant pool, acceptance rate, and matriculation rate with partner institution
- **Notes:**
  - Develop partnerships with minority-serving institutions for PhD students. Some programs currently exist in CAS.
  - Potential partner is Cal Poly Pomona which has a high LatinX community. The former
Boston University Chief of Staff for the Provost is currently the Chief of Staff of the President of Cal Poly Pomona and set up the connection between BU and Cal Poly.

**Action 1.5)**
- **Task:** Discussion of postdoc-to-faculty pilot program
- **Owner:** CAS Dean and ENG Dean
- **Sponsor/Approver:** Department Chairs and Division Heads
- **Timeline:** January - May 2020
- **Metrics:** Success of the program (if put into place) will be measured by monitoring (1) applicant and participant population and (2) impact on specific departmental hiring
- **Notes:**
  - Discussion of program
  - Estimate costs of program
  - Look at examples of successful programs, e.g. University of California, Northeastern University

**Goal:** Prospective Faculty Campus visits

**Action 1.6)**
- **Task:** ARROWS Prospective Faculty Meetings
- **Owner:** Director, ARROWS
- **Sponsor/Approver:** Search Committee Chairs
- **Timeline:** Ongoing, continuation and expansion of current program
- **Metrics:** Success will be assessed by monitoring (1) usage of program, and (2) recruitment success
- **Notes:**
  - Previous successful hires (women in STEM) in Physics and Math departments
  - New in Fall 2018 was search committee training by APDI that highlighted this program
  - Display prominently on ARROWS website and provide links on appropriate Diversity and Department webpages
  - Meetings with ARROWS faculty outside of recruiting department are not reported back to the search committee but instead are meant to demonstrate community present on campus
  - We have noticed that other schools outside of CAS and ENG have requested this service, but this is out of scope for ARROWS. We therefore need to have conversations with appropriate Chairs as to how to develop a potential program that is available more broadly outside of STEM

**Action 1.7)**
- **Task:** The Recruitment Committee
- **Owner:** APDI
- **Sponsor/Approver:** Search Committee Chairs
- **Timeline:** Newly formed in Fall 2018
- **Metrics:** Success will be assessed by monitoring the usage of the program and recruitment success
- **Notes:**
  - Underrepresented minority faculty meet with underrepresented minority faculty candidates on campus visits
  - This is not limited to STEM but covers the entire University
  - This is important because CAS and ENG in the STEM departments as shown in our self-assessment has a low number of URM STEM faculty
**Goal:** Supporting promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

- **Action 2.1)**
  - **Task:** Tenure and Promotion Informational Workshop for CAS Faculty
  - **Owner:** Senior Associate Provost
  - **Sponsor/Approver:** Provost
  - **Timeline:** Spring 2019 - Fall 2019
  - **Metrics:** This is an informational session
  - **Notes:**
    - Last presented during new faculty orientation in January 2016, but many assistant professors were unable to attend
    - Take attendance so we can track attendees
    - ARROWS will consider workshop or followup workshop with CV review
    - ARROWS will consider how this workshop fits into mentoring process for assistant professors and if there are unique issues for women and URM STEM assistant professors

- **Action 2.2)**
  - **Task:** Tenure and Promotion Workshop
  - **Owner:** Tenure and Promotion Coordinator, CAS Office of Faculty Development
  - **Sponsor/Approver:** CAS Dean
  - **Timeline:** Early Spring 2019 and Early Spring 2020
  - **Metrics:** This is an informational session
  - **Notes:**
    - CAS holds information workshops about the process early each spring semester for all assistant professors about to undergo review
    - Goal is not developmental, but rather informational

**Goal:** Supporting promotion from Associate to Full Professor

- **Action 2.3)**
  - **Task:** Informational Workshop on Policies and Process for Promotion
  - **Owner:** Senior Associate Provost
  - **Sponsor/Approver:** Provost
  - **Timeline:** Spring or Fall 2019
  - **Metrics:** This is an informational session
  - **Notes:**
    - First pilot held in Fall 2017 (CAS) and in Spring 2018 (ENG)
    - ARROWS will consider adding followup CV review component (Medical Campus currently conducts CV promotion review)

- **Action 2.4)**
  - **Task:** Promotion Workshop
  - **Owner:** Tenure and Promotion Coordinator, CAS Office of Faculty Development
  - **Sponsor/Approver:** CAS Dean
  - **Timeline:** Fall 2019 and Fall 2020
  - **Metrics:** This is an informational session
  - **Notes:**
- CAS conducts annual workshops about the policies and process for those considering promotion review every fall and have done so for several years

**Goal:** Grantsmanship Skills for Assistant STEM Professors

- **Action 2.5**
  - **Task:** Pilot grant pitches with feedback for all BU STEM assistant professors
  - **Owner:** VP of Research and Public Relations Office
  - **Sponsor/Approver:** BU ARROWS
  - **Timeline:** Spring 2019 (target for pilot)
  - **Metrics:** Success will be measured by assessing grant funding success before and after pitch training. This will be most evident in grant re-submissions.
  - **Notes:**
    - Success of such a program has already been demonstrated in a MED campus pilot program
    - Idea suggested from ARROWS assistant professors and ARROWS assistant professor programming committee
    - Pilot will be for all STEM assistant professors
    - Pilot will focus on funding from National Institutes of Health
    - Based on pilot, other areas will be carried out
    - Draw from experiences from Medical Campus grant pitch sessions and workshops that are ongoing to help with grant proposals
    - Could be basis of streamlining process for enhancing support for grant submissions

**Goal:** Salary Inequity

- **Action 2.6**
  - **Task:** Assessment of salary equity issues
  - **Owner:** Director, Hariri Institute for Computing
  - **Sponsor/Approver:** Boston Women’s Workforce Council
  - **Timeline:**
    - Oct 2019 (data collection process target date)
    - Spring 2020 (dry run of faculty and staff salary data collection)
  - **Metrics:** Success will be measured using the framework developed in consultation with the Boston Women’s Workforce Council, which is operating in-house at the BU Hariri Institute
  - **Notes:**
    - Kick-off event to-be-held to celebrate BU recently signing the 100% Talent Compact (Boston Women’s Workforce Council)
    - Plan is to collect EEOC data and identify gaps
**ACTION AREA 3: Institutional Climate**

**Goal: LGBTQIA+ Inclusivity**

- **Action 3.1)**
  - **Task:** Create recommendations for improving LGBTQIA inclusion across the University
  - **Owner:** Task Force on LGBTQIA+ Faculty & Staff
  - **Sponsor/Approver:** APDI
  - **Timeline:**
    - Feb. 2019: Set of interim recommendations from the Task Force ready
    - Spring 2019: Update of interim recommendations given at Faculty Assembly
    - May 2019: Full report given to Provost and the Senior Vice President for Operations
  - **Metrics:** This is information gathering

- **Action 3.2)**
  - **Task:** Convene LGBTQIA+ student groups to review recommendations made by Task Force
  - **Owner:** TBD (will be determined closer to date, but will be supported by ARROWS)
  - **Sponsor/Approver:** ARROWS
  - **Timeline:**
    - Sep. or Oct. 2019: Convene meeting of LGBTQIA+ student groups (cannot do earlier because of summer break)
  - **Metrics:** Identify key proposals with buy-in from undergraduate and graduate students.
  - **Notes:** Although Task Force is making recommendations for Faculty & Staff, the resulting recommendations would also affect graduate and undergraduate students. As a group, these students should be able to review the recommendations, identify those they strongly agree with, and discuss how they might want to advocate for their implementation.

**Goal: Sexual Assault & Misconduct Prevention**

- **Action 3.3)**
  - **Task:** Participate in the AAU 2019 Survey on Sexual Assault and Misconduct
  - **Owner:** Associate Provost for Graduate Affairs
  - **Sponsor/Approver:** Provost
  - **Timeline:** Spring 2019
  - **Metrics:** This is information gathering

- **Action 3.4)**
  - **Task:** Develop language on University’s Sexual Misconduct policies to be placed in students’ syllabi
  - **Owner:** ARROWS
  - **Sponsor/Approver:** University Title IX Coordinator
  - **Timeline:**
    - Jan. - Feb. 2019: Develop text
    - Mar. - Apr. 2019: Meet with pilot professors to explain
    - May 2019: Place them in some syllabi for Summer semester, evaluate whether there are any unexpected challenges to including in syllabi
    - August 2019: If successful, expand with ARROWS faculty in Fall 2019
    - December 2019: If successful, send faculty-wide email with text, explanation for Spring 2020
  - **Metrics:** Informal survey with participating faculty to assess pilot

**Goal: Combatting Impostor Syndrome**

- **Action 3.5)**
○ Task: Create directory of all recent work that has been done / is being done to address Impostor Syndrome across Boston University
  ○ Owner: ARROWS administrator
  ○ Sponsor/Approver: ARROWS Director
  ○ Timeline: Spring 2019 - Fall 2019
  ○ Metric: Assess website analytics including web page hit rates

- Action 3.6)
  ○ Task: Pilot a student-led campaign highlighting stories of Impostor Syndrome to further gauge interest on this topic among student body, most active student groups
  ○ Owner: ARROWS administrator
  ○ Sponsor/Approver: ARROWS Director
  ○ Timeline: Spring 2019
  ○ Metrics: Social media analytics and webpage analytics; assess course drop rate before and after campaign, especially of courses traditionally known by students to be 'weed-out' courses

- Action 3.7)
  ○ Task: If Action 3.6 demonstrates student or faculty interest in further Impostor Syndrome work, begin discussing idea of larger, potentially University-wide campaign with appropriate communication networks, stakeholder buy-in, support from upper administration, etc.
  ○ Owner: TBD, depends on success of Action 3.6
  ○ Timeline: Fall 2019
  ○ Notes: Potentially will engage undergraduate and graduate program leadership to discuss how to expand impact of campaign. If we do proceed with this, we will need appropriate communication networks, stakeholder buy-in, support from upper administration, etc.