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Introduction

This report is intended to be a living document, with multiple phases addressing the diversity of departments and academic institutions where women faculty are employed. The current phase of the report (Phase I) outlines the practices, policies, and procedures that PhD granting departments and universities are adopting across the United States to increase the recruitment, retention, and advancement of women in academia. The next phase (Phase II) will incorporate policies and resources based on a review of AA, BA, and MA granting departments/universities’ practices (including community colleges). Work on the next phase is set to take place during the summer of 2016 and will continue into the fall of 2016. Given the scope and urgency of the level of women’s under-representation, the committee feels that it would be beneficial to release these reports as the information becomes available rather than delay the release until the review of all types of institutions can be completed.

That women are under-represented in the political science profession, and in higher education faculty more generally, is well established. While the percentage of women earning a doctorate in all fields has increased from 12% in 1966 to over 50% in 2008, the proportion of women in full-time faculty positions lags significantly behind, even more so at the upper echelons of full professors and key administrative positions such as Deans, Provosts, and University presidents. Within political science, the picture is very similar. In 2014, women accounted for 44% of all doctorates conferred in political science¹, but in a recent, large survey of APSA members, women accounted for only 39% of full time faculty. At the twenty largest PhD granting political science departments, the proportion of women is significantly lower.²

Colleges and universities have undertaken many initiatives to advance the recruitment, retention, and career progression of women in academia, yet scope, type, and impact of these initiatives are still not broadly known within the political science profession. This report aims to introduce readers to the variety of practices, policies, and procedures that colleges and universities are currently using to advance women in the profession, or what we refer to as “pipeline practices.” Our use of the term is intended to emphasize two important points. First, establishing true gender equality requires diversity initiatives that address the full lifespan of an academic career. Second, as sociologist Paula England has argued, it may be true that “best practices” are yet to be invented. Her spirit of realistic optimism, embracing incremental progress, while remaining cognizant of continued challenges, informs this report. Our hope, therefore, is that this document will be revised and expanded over time, as we collectively generate new solutions and better understand what ‘works’ and what does not. Perhaps, if such time should come, the lack of gender disparities will render it obsolete.

Many of the policies discussed are adopted at the university or college level, but departments –

² Data to be made available on the microsite.
including department chairs, faculty search committees, and tenure and promotion committees – are important venues for turning them into practice. As such, these resources are gathered with individual faculty members and graduate students in mind as the primary readers. The report provides a ‘first glance’ for getting insight into what to look for, where to find more resources, and encouraging individuals to seek out the resources that may already exist.

This report begins with a survey of practices employed by universities hosting the twenty largest political science departments in the United States, as defined by the number of Ph.Ds. granted in political science per year. In addition, throughout the research process we solicited recommendations from respondents of other departments or universities they would identify as having innovative policies for eliminating gender disparity. This resulted in the inclusion of an additional eighteen departments. The full list of departments consulted is contained at the end of the report.

The first part of the report, detailing practices across the whole of the academic lifespan, is drawn from this survey. As such, they reflect the resources, interests, and concerns relevant to research-intensive, PhD granting universities. The focus on doctoral-granting institutions as a first step is intentional: graduate degree granting departments play a key role in orienting and professionalizing new graduate students into the norms of the discipline. This can include both formal modes of professionalization, as take place in classes on research methods, disciplinary content, or ethics, but can also include informal modes of professionalization through modeling and conversation. This provides cues for how to address broader career, professional, and ‘work-life’ issues. If graduate students are to encounter successful academics who are women, and they are to encounter successful academics who are parents – both men and women – thereby setting their own expectations for what can and cannot be accomplished, graduate faculties are an important introductory environment for such exposure (Mason, Wolfinger, and Goulden 2013).

Nevertheless, while PhD departments may play an important role, many faculty will go on to be employed in MA, BA, or AA granting departments. Thus, many of the practices discussed in this phase of the report apply widely, but some may not. Given the unit of analysis of this report, individuals looking for practices from what they might consider peer-institutions may not find adequate examples. Thus, as stated earlier a second phase is planned, which will review and highlight policies and practices of AA, BA, and MA granting departments/intuitions. In the meantime, to enhance the reader’s ability to draw comparisons based upon their home institution type, in part two of this report, you will find resources and websites for universities and colleges sorted by the highest degree in political science offered. We also identify colleges and universities that have received an ADVANCE grant (for any discipline or multiple disciplines) from the National Science Foundation. Where applicable, we have included links to publicly available ADVANCE websites and faculty handbooks at those institutions.

Recognizing the diversity of experiences that go beyond gender, this report also includes sections on resources for women of color and women in the LGBTQ community, with specific recommendations that may be useful when addressing the effects of intersectional identities. In addition, the sortable sheet of resources and links by institution type also includes links to LGBTQ resource pages, and identifies
Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Historically Hispanic Serving Institutions (HBCUs and HHSIs, or collectively Minority Serving Institutions – MSIs) and women’s colleges.

Finally, our report focuses on pipeline practices that have been adopted within the existing framework of a tenure track system of promotion and advancement at large PhD granting institutions. We hope that this allows the practices introduced to be more broadly applicable and easily adopted by departments in similarly-structured institutions. All of the strategies described were implemented at US-based universities. Thus, they are framed both by American promotion and tenure practices and by the regulatory and legal stipulations of non-discrimination that apply to US-based and/or accredited universities.

However, this document does not constitute legal advice. For those faculty who are involved in hiring, be sure to consult with your college or university’s human resources, equal employment and opportunity office (EEO), office of diversity and inclusion, or other relevant administrations offices and departments. Practices at certain universities may be updated or have changed since the time of study. Should you encounter any out of date information or descriptions, please contact the committee at diversityprograms@apsanet.org. We will compile the submitted information and release updated editions of this report on a regular basis.

The report is organized to reflect the life-cycle of post-PhD scholars in the profession who are either pursuing or have successfully attained tenure-track and tenured appointments. Sections focus on Recruitment and Hiring, Retaining Faculty, and Intersecting Identities. Towards the end you will find a glossary of terms, further reading on the scholarship of women in higher education, and articles specific to women in the political science profession.
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Recruitment and Hiring

This section focuses on pipeline practices for the initial stages of acquiring tenure-track or tenured appointments at PhD granting institutions. We separate the process into three aspects: advertising opportunities to potential candidates, recruiting candidates to solicit applications, and reviewing candidate applications.

Advertising

- Choose advertising outlets that are read by diverse groups of faculty.
- Write emails to chairs of departments asking them to nominate top graduate students with special attention to women and those from under-represented backgrounds.
- Use discipline specific job boards, such as those provided by the American Historical Association (AHA) or the American Political Science Association (APSA).
- For some disciplines, be aware of the Higher Education Regional Consortium (HERC), which is a resource that lists jobs available on member campuses. HERC is most useful for administrative jobs, but can be useful when dealing with challenges that arise in dual-career situations.
  - Regions include: the Greater Chicago/Midwest; Metro New York and Southern Connecticut; Greater Oregon and Greater Washington State; Mid-Atlantic; Michigan; NJ/Eastern PA/DE; and the Upper Midwest

Recruitment

Emulate techniques implemented by the most successful ADVANCE programs. Funded by the National Science Foundation, ADVANCE aims at increasing recruitment and retention of women faculty in STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics). Examples of ADVANCE programs include:
  - ADVANCE, U. Washington
  - ADVANCE, U. Michigan
  - WISELI at U Wisconsin

Develop Recruitment Guides for conducting job searches that maximize diversity and gender equity. Some examples include:
  - Guide to Recruiting and Retaining an Excellent and Diverse Faculty at Stanford University
  - Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring at U. Michigan
  - Yale University Faculty Search and Promotion Guide

Emulate postdoctoral and fellowship programs that recruit candidates whose research and teaching will contribute to diversity in the profession. Examples include:
The University of Michigan has recently developed a Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship Program.

The University of California, Berkeley has a longstanding Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship Program.

Solicit participation and resources from on-campus equity- and diversity-maximizing institutions. At many universities, the office of faculty diversity is involved at each stage of the recruitment process. For example, Harvard’s Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion coordinates with departments on recruitment practices.

**Reviewing Candidate Applications**

- Establish diverse search committees that pay attention to issues of gender, race, sexual identity and socio-economic status.
- Appoint a “diversity representative” to pay special attention to the search process.
- Spread awareness on unexamined bias during searches and throughout the faculty. Encourage efforts to mitigate those biases in your process.
- Establish criteria before the search to avoid the tendency for people to choose people similar to themselves.
- Avoid overly-specific search criteria as this may suggest that search committees already have a particular candidate in mind.
- Remind faculty that the primary goal of the interview is to assess the candidate, not to “test the candidate under fire.” Confrontational or demeaning questions, comments, or behavior are neither professional nor promote the integrity of the search.
- Take note of the campus resources that support diversity in hiring. Examples include:
  - Michigan’s STRIDE program is a model of faculty-led diversity training for every faculty search.
  - Cornell University offers an interactive theater workshop examining biases in recruitment, [It Depends on the Lens](http://www.itdependsonthelens.com).
  - The Women in Sciences and Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI) at the University of Wisconsin has created [materials on unexamined bias](http://www.isee.wisc.edu/diversity/training/).
Recruitment and Hiring: The Family Dimension

Dual-Career Services

According to a May 2014 American Institutes for Research study, it is common for female scholars in heterosexual marriages to be in lower-status, lower paying positions than their husbands. According to the study, this pattern is a result of family structure. Men in heterosexual marriages tend to be older than their wives. Since they have spent more time building their careers, they tend to better-established and higher-earning. Some families prioritize the career mobility of men over their partners, reinforcing disparity over time. One way to combat this problem is to recognize that many female scholars are part of a two-career family and plan accordingly.

- Prepare reports compiling information on the resources for faculty and graduate students negotiating dual careers.
  - The Clayman Institute for Gender Research at Stanford provides such a report with information pertinent to other institutions “Dual-Career Academic Couples: What Universities Need to Know.”
- Develop and publicize dual career policies.
  - See UC Berkeley’s policy on partner hiring
  - See University of Rhode Island’s resources on dual career hiring. These lay out the process for departments and candidates to follow when pursuing a dual career hire, eliminating many of the unknown elements of the process.
- Avoid stigmatizing language such as “trailing spouse.” (U.C. Hastings College of Law)
- Provide a searchable database for jobs available to partners.
- Offer relocation services for prospective and new faculty.
  - CALcierge, U.C. Berkeley’s office for faculty recruitment and retention streamlines this process
- Create specialized positions for handling dual-career-related issues. For example, in 2008 the University of Chicago opened a Dual Career Office. Princeton has a special Assistant to the Dean of the Faculty who provides assistance in partner placement or any other family matter in connection with the recruitment or retention of a faculty member.
- Ensure that family and spousal oriented resources explicitly consider same sex marriages.
- Offer information on the university’s provisions for child and elder care and advertise the university’s commitment to the quality of life for all faculty.
- Avoid asking about a candidate’s family status. Discrimination on the basis of family status is illegal. Offer the same information of family services as a default, regardless of gender, age race/ethnicity or real or perceived sexual orientation/identity.
Retaining Faculty

The Family Dimension
One of the main challenges for universities and departments seeking to cultivate a diverse faculty is that female faculty tend to leave the profession at higher rates than their male counterparts. Goulden, Mason and Frasch (2011) demonstrate that women are both less likely to seek academic research positions after they receive their PhDs. and more likely to leave tenure-track appointments before they receive tenure. A major cause of this attrition is the disproportionate burden that familial responsibilities place on female academics. Notably, the major stages at which women tend to drop out of the profession occur during child-bearing years. These can often overlap with key ‘make or break’ years as candidates finish graduate school, apply for post-docs and tenure track positions, and prepare for tenure review. Creating, widely publicizing, and encouraging the use of family-friendly resources during these years can be a key component of retaining faculty who are starting or have young families. Here are a few of the practices and found at the universities that we surveyed.

Teaching Relief for Childcare

- Many universities offer one semester of workload relief for faculty members, male or female, who have primary responsibility for care of an infant or pre-school child. This policy generally applies at the university level and covers all departments.
- Some universities, including UC Berkeley and Columbia, offer a semester of teaching relief for each faculty parent who takes half or more of the responsibility for childcare, making it possible for a faculty couple who share childcare equally to take a total of one year per child.
- In some cases, such as Harvard’s Kennedy School, the childcare leave is automatic to any faculty member who states to the dean in person that he or she takes half or more of the responsibility for childcare in the household. “Half or more” is interpreted to mean the responsibility remaining beyond paid childcare, (although this policy is thought to benefit more affluent parents).

Tenure Clock Extension

Many research universities extend the tenure clock by one year for each faculty member who has taken a semester of teaching relief for childcare.

Family-Friendly Policies

- Some Universities host websites specifically devoted to family-friendly policies.
  - U.C. System: [http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/ucfamilyfriendlyedge.html](http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/ucfamilyfriendlyedge.html)
  - U. Michigan: [https://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/family/](https://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/family/)
  - Duke: [http://www.hr.duke.edu/benefits/family/](http://www.hr.duke.edu/benefits/family/)
Childcare Assistance

- Backup Care Advantage Program provides up to 100 hours of subsidized backup care per calendar year—($4/hr of in-home care, $2/hr of center-based care) for university employees at schools such as Berkeley, Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Northwestern, Princeton, Stanford, U. Washington, and Yale.
- Employee Child Care Assistance grants are relatively common to offset the costs of childcare.
- Student Child Care Assistance Programs provide awards of up to $5,000 to help eligible graduate and undergraduate students meet child care costs.
  - Please see Princeton’s policy
- Extra child care coverage during midterms and finals provided in form of stipends for students (Utah State, UC Santa Barbara)
- Child Care Support for Professional Travel
  - Please see Brown’s policy as an example.
- Dependent Care Flexible Spending Account
  - Please see Cornell’s resources
- On-Campus Childcare Centers
  - Please see the University of Washington
- Flexible On-Call Sitters: up-to-date list of people who offer flexible care on an on-call basis
  - Please see Stanford
- Police-provided child safety seat installment
  - Please see the University of Maryland, Baltimore County

Family-Friendly Scheduling Policies

- Hold important meetings between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. to minimize conflict with family duties.

Part-Time Tenure Track

- Some universities allow women to work part time while working towards tenure. This is more common in medical schools where there are multiple tracks to tenure. (Similar to the mother-only parental leave policy, this is controversial because it appears to reinforce the mother’s role in childcare rather than to promote more equal parenting).

Fostering an Inclusive Campus Culture

Fostering an inclusive and welcoming environment can enable faculty to focus on core duties of teaching, research and service. Faculty who do not feel they belong may not thrive professionally.

Creating an inclusive environment

- Learn about climate and how to create positive workplace climates.
  - UM offers climate workshops through the CRLT Players: http://www.crlt.umich.edu/crltplayers/sketches-other-services?tid_1%5B%5D=405&tid_2=All
• “School for Chairs”: Train chairs to recognize the signs of strong and weak departmental culture, and provide suggestions on how to create strong campus morale.

• Sexual harassment is illegal. Many universities will provide training, in some cases annually, to all faculty regarding sexual and other forms of workplace harassment.
  - Some universities now offer an ‘ombuds’ who offer independent, impartial, informal problem-solving resource serving faculty, staff, and students.
  - See Boston University’s Office of the Ombuds: [http://www.bu.edu/ombuds/](http://www.bu.edu/ombuds/)

• Provide resources and venues for social and intellectual exchange across departments. This is particularly important in universities and colleges with small departments.

• Create a welcoming environment for LGBTQ faculty and students. Many universities have an Office of LGBTQ Resources and encourage LGBTQ affinity groups on campus to meet regularly.

• Cafeteria-Style Benefits: Universities can encourage widespread support for family-friendly policies by allowing employees to design their own benefits packages from a list of options, providing resources that work for all employees regardless of family status.

Mentoring

• Research shows that mentoring can help scholars achieve stronger results. In 2009 Francine Blau and her colleagues on the American Economic Association’s Committee for the Status of Women undertook a randomized, controlled experiment in face-to-face mentoring of junior faculty. The mentored faculty were more likely than their un-mentored counterparts to submit their work for publication, get published, and get promoted. Read the report here: [American Economic Association Mentoring Study](http://www.aeaweb.org/).

• Teach chairs how to mentor faculty throughout the tenure process, to make expectations clear and to ensure that faculty get regular and constructive feedback at every stage of review and promotion.

• One-to-One Faculty Mentoring Program: Provide a formal mechanism for new tenure-track faculty members to receive advice from one or more tenured faculty mentor. It can be a good idea to supplement a departmental mentor with someone from outside the department who will not be directly involved in the evaluation process but who can be a more general “coach.” (The APSA has a long-standing online mentor program for that includes senior faculty mentoring graduate students and junior faculty. Providing mentors for women in the profession is a key component of this program).

• Eminent Scholar Mentoring Program: Small departments might also consider establishing a mentoring relationship between a female untenured professor and a prominent researcher in their field.
  - Consider developing a program of “Launch Committees” for faculty in their first year, similarly to the [University of Michigan](http://www.umich.edu).  

• Encourage faculty to mentor those of different backgrounds to them, whether on the grounds of gender, race, socio-economic status or sexual identity.
Reviews and Promotions

- The same high standards for unbiased review that govern hiring practices should be used throughout review and promotion processes.
- Be alert to potential bias in the selection of “gate-keepers” who are invited to write letters of evaluation.
- Look out for biased language in letters of review. Some potential examples include
  - Phrases that use masculine pronouns when no specific person is being discussed. For example ‘An excellent scholar conducts his research...’
  - A failure to refer to men and women on similar terms. For example using the term ‘men’ in conjunction with the term ‘females’.
- Ensure that evaluators do not penalize faculty who extend their tenure clocks for family work.
- Utilize on campus resources to spread awareness and educate.
  - The University of Michigan (UofM) uses an interactive theater workshop (The Fence) to help committee members reflect on how best to conduct reviews [http://www.crlt.umich.edu/crltplayers/sketches-other-services?tid_1%5B%5D=405&tid_2=All](http://www.crlt.umich.edu/crltplayers/sketches-other-services?tid_1%5B%5D=405&tid_2=All)
  - In addition, UofM provides a flyer with reminders to all committee members [http://advance.umich.edu/resources/FASTERThirdYearTenurePromotionGuidelines.pdf](http://advance.umich.edu/resources/FASTERThirdYearTenurePromotionGuidelines.pdf)
- Protect untenured faculty from excessive administrative work.
  - To the extent that they are underrepresented in departments and universities, women and people of color are vulnerable to multiple requests for committee service.
Intersecting Identities

This section draws attention to some concerns and resources that are specific to the needs of women of color and women in the LGBTQ community.

Women of Color

According to 2010 data, 86.6% of female faculty are white. Given that white women make up 63% of the US population, women of color are severely underrepresented in the wider pool of academia, and may face discrimination on a variety of fronts. Many of the trends that affect women’s success in academia, such as attrition rates in graduate school, negative stereotyping in response to assertive behavior, and low reported rates of satisfaction with the climate of their workplaces can be worse for women of color.

All the universities surveyed have Offices of Institutional Diversity and ethnic student associations. A limited number also have cultural centers, spaces specifically devoted towards enriching the intellectual, social, and cultural life of underrepresented individuals and groups. Our recommendations focus on these institutions. Universities should:

- Ensure that graduate students faculty who identify as underrepresented individuals are aware of the most current diversity initiatives, programs, and resources available through the office of institutional diversity.
- Disseminate information on racial and ethnic faculty and student associations, which can serve as a conduit for forming supportive professional networks by encouraging early and late stage PhD students and faculty to socialize and network with each other.
- Discuss a variety of career options and opportunities Familiarize yourself with programs such as Howard University’s ADVANCE-IT, a set of diversity initiatives funded by the National Science Foundation that has created programs to connect women of color with faculty mentors, create conferences that feature the research of women of color, and provide grants for research projects. In addition they have also gathered a number of useful online resources at [http://www.portal.advance.vt.edu/](http://www.portal.advance.vt.edu/).
- Broaden the communities that are specifically addressed in institutional literature on diversity. Resources tend to focus on African-American and Hispanic communities, with relatively less content that is focused upon for Native American, Asian American, and Pacific Islander students.
- Consider offering diversity training to students, faculty, and advisors in the career and placement office so that they can be aware of the specific stereotypes and challenges that women of color may face during the job search.
- Likewise, offer training to women of color job candidates to assist with developing strategies to respond to discrimination and implicit bias in interviews and professional settings.
LGBTQ Women

Statistical information on Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgendered and Queer (LGBTQ) women in the social sciences is more difficult to find, partly because of the relatively few data collection projects that include LGBTQ-related survey items and secondly, some surveys relating to the LGBTQ community do not publish data disaggregated by sex.

In one 2011 survey of political scientists, the majority (56%) of LGBTQ academics reported that their sexual identity probably hadn’t or definitely hadn’t affected their career trajectory. However, 25% believed that they had faced discrimination, suggesting that sexual preference and gender identity are demographic factors that can lead to real and/or perceived discrimination. According to the survey, the three greatest issues of concern for LGBTQ academics are provisions for spouses and long-term partners, the negative perceptions that are attached to LGBTQ scholars who study LGBTQ issues, and low satisfaction with the workplace climate. To address these issues universities should:

- Ensure that their policies on spousal hiring and parental leave establish equity between the treatment of LGBTQ and heterosexual couples
- Consider creating a mechanism to formally measure any potential disparities between how spouses are accommodated in LGBTQ and heterosexual communities
- Note how childcare policies may apply to families and same sex couples who adopt children
- Provide information on how to confidentially report instances of discrimination and harassment
- Advertise the presence of LGBTQ faculty and student organizations to provide supportive networks
- Train mental health staff to be aware of how discriminatory climates may increase stress and negatively impact wellbeing and equip them to counsel members of the community appropriately
### Universities Consulted in Phase I

- Boston University
- Brown University
- Case Western Reserve University
- Columbia University
- Cornell University
- Duke University
- Fisk University
- Harvard University
- Howard University
- Iowa State University
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)
- New Mexico State University
- Northwestern University
- Notre Dame University
- Ohio State University
- Princeton University
- Stanford University
- Spelman College
- Texas A&M University
- Tufts University
- University of California—Berkeley
- University of California—Davis
- University of California—Hastings, School of Law
- University of California—Irvine
- University of California—Los Angeles
- University of California—Santa Barbara
- University of Chicago
- University of Delaware
- University of Idaho
- University of Illinois—Champaign-Urbana
- University of Maryland
- University of Maryland—Baltimore County
- University of Michigan
- University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill
- University of North Carolina—Charlotte
- University of Pennsylvania
- University of Washington
- University of Wisconsin
- University of Wisconsin—Madison
- Utah State University
- Yale University
Glossary of Terms

Cluster hiring: The practice of hiring multiple scholars into one or more departments based on shared, interdisciplinary research interests. For examples of how some universities have used cluster hiring to promote diversity on campus, see this [Inside Higher Ed article on cluster hiring](https://www.insidehighered.com) from May 2015 by Colleen Flaherty.

Diversity: According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, “the quality or state of having many different forms, types, ideas.” In universities, faculty diversity serves a barometer of openness to all available talent. Additionally, faculty diversity sends important signals to students about their place in society. See stereotype threat, below. Levine et al. (2014) has demonstrated that diverse decision-making bodies tend to promote more effective decisions than their more homogeneous counterparts.

Dual-Career Problem: also known as the two-body problem. This refers to the challenges that long-term academic couples face in finding tenure track appointments within commuting distance of each other.

Implicit bias: Bias that results from subtle, cognitive processes and does not necessarily reflect consciously-endorsed views. A robust body of peer-reviewed research suggests that implicit bias against women and ethnic/racial minorities is common and has a detrimental influence on decision making and assessment. Consider taking the [Implicit Attitude Test](https://www.harvard.edu) from Professor Mazarin Banaji’s lab at Harvard’s Department of Psychology.

Inclusion: Merriam-Webster defines “include” as to have (someone or something) as part of a group or total: to contain (someone or something) in a group or as a part of something; to make (someone or something) a part of something.

Statistical discrimination: In the absence of direct information about ability, decision makers often substitute individual evaluations with assessments of the average performance of the group to which an individual belongs. It implies that, if an individual belongs to a group that performs worse on average, evaluations of their individual performance will suffer as a result. See Ken Arrow (1971) and Daniel Kahneman (2003) for a fuller treatment of this concept.

Stereotype threat: Claude Steele and Joshua Aronson (1995) showed that individuals respond to reminders of stereotypes by inadvertently fulfilling them. Thus, if there is a stereotype that implies they should perform poorly on a certain task, any reference to the stereotype will provoke declines in performance.

Unbiased academic review: Review policies that acknowledge, raise awareness of and seek to mitigate the effects of implicit bias, statistical discrimination, and stereotype threat when participating in hiring and review committees and decision making.
Selected Resources

Articles in two APSA journals, *PS: Political Science and Politics*, and *Perspectives on Politics*, as well as relevant APSA Task Force Reports and articles on mentoring in the profession.

**PS Articles**

2016

2015


2014
http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9235749&fulltextType=XX&fileId=S104909651400033X

2013
http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=8874425&fulltextType=NW&fileId=S1049096513000048

2012
http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=7963684&fulltextType=DS&fileId=S1049096511002034
http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=8511135&fulltextType=DS&fileId=S1049096512000042

2011
http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=8407143&fulltextType=NW&fileId=S1049096511001284

2010
http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=7528448&fulltextType=NW&fileId=S104909651000017X

2009
http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=5293336&fulltextType=BT&fileId=S104909650909057X
http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=5293348&fulltextType=BT&fileId=S1049096509090581
http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=5293396&fulltextType=BT&fileId=S1049096509090623

http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=5293408&fulltextType=BT&fileId=S1049096509090635

http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=1905976&fulltextType=BT&fileId=S1049096508230908

http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=1631296&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S1049096508080232

http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=506372&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S1049096506061191

http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=293218&fulltextType=SC&fileId=S1049096505056258

http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=257378&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S1049096504045329


http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=147405&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S1049096503002269

2002


http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=134537&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S1049096502001336


http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=134529&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S1049096502001294

2001


http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=105441&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S1049096501000580
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