

**Advancing  
a Respectful and  
Caring Community  
Learning by Doing at MIT**

**Executive Summary  
&  
Summary of Recommendations**

Edmund Bertschinger

Institute Community and Equity Officer

February 11, 2015

[iceoreport.mit.edu](http://iceoreport.mit.edu)

© 2015 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In his inaugural address, President L. Rafael Reif stated, “I will lead MIT to continue to make significant contributions in the area of race and diversity, equity and inclusion.” He added, “In terms of creating a true culture of inclusion, MIT remains a work in progress, but I believe we have the power to lead the way. My dream is that by the time MIT selects its 18th president, our diversity will no longer need to be a matter of presidential declarations, because it will be a welcome, obvious reality and a vital source of MIT’s creative strength.”

In 2013 I was appointed the first institute community and equity officer (ICEO) at MIT, a position supporting President Reif’s goals of enhancing the experience of MIT community members and helping them to leverage the power of diversity. During the past 18 months I have heard from hundreds of community members—students, staff, postdocs, faculty, alumni, retirees, family members, and others—who embrace this call and seek to evolve or shift the culture so as to more effectively advance a respectful and caring community that is far more than the sum of its parts. The people of MIT strongly desire the fulfillment of the concluding sentence of the MIT mission statement, “We seek to develop in each member of the MIT community the ability and passion to work wisely, creatively, and effectively for the betterment of humankind.”

Shifting a culture requires that it first be understood. I undertook a study of MIT culture using the approach developed by Professor Edgar Schein of the Sloan School of Management for application in the business world. The cultural analysis was easily adapted to a university setting.

The outcome of this year-long study is a detailed investigation of MIT community and culture: what makes MIT special, which elements of the culture support the MIT mission, what factors limit our success, and recommendations for improvement. It is not a traditional plan for diversity and inclusion, which would focus on demographic composition and climate. The scope is broader because MIT’s interests are broader. This report focuses on community and culture. Diversity, equity, and inclusion emerge as key parts of the MIT culture and not only as enablers of our mission.

This report has three specific goals. The first is to develop a plan for the MIT community to deepen the sense of inclusion based on shared values and to help community members benefit from diversity. The second is to present specific achievable goals for advancing community and equity along with means for assessing progress toward these goals. The third is to define the role of the ICEO.

The title of the report is “Advancing a Respectful and Caring Community: Learning by Doing at MIT.” It could have been subtitled, Preparing for the 22nd Century. I cannot predict what technology or pedagogy will most benefit MIT in 85 years, but I am confident that those universities that empower all of their community members to feel respected and supported, so

that the greatest possible diversity of talent and perspectives is available for problem solving, will thrive. Until we can embrace our diversity, exercise empathy, and advance caring and respect, we will never achieve our full potential as individuals or as an Institute.

Most MIT reports present ideas to change the world. This one presents ideas to change MIT. Because we cannot effectively change what we do not understand, the first half of this report is an exploration of MIT community and cultures. In Section 1, these concepts are developed in detail, giving perspectives from many different positions in the community. MIT's core values are examined early on because they shape the culture. A long list of **core values** is discussed in Section 2:

- Learning by doing
- Meritocracy, at its best
- Equity and inclusion
- Excellence
- Collaborative problem solving
- Innovation and entrepreneurship
- Diversity of thought, experience, ability, background, and perspective
- Humility
- Integrity
- Openness
- Service

A useful exercise for the reader is to select three top values at MIT, from this list or elsewhere, and compare your list with other people's lists. This comparison itself will reveal substantial diversity of thought from which we can learn and benefit as a community.

After an exploration of the culture and core values, ICEO mission and vision statements are constructed in Section 3:

**Mission:** *The ICEO mission is to advance a respectful and caring community that embraces diversity and empowers everyone to learn and do their best at MIT.*

**Vision:** *MIT will be famous for community, diversity, empowerment, and respect.*

Section 3 concludes with the first major recommendation of the report, which builds on the key role of values in shaping culture and experience:

**Create an MIT Compact:** *Assemble a representative working group to write a brief statement of what we aspire to as a community and what we expect of one another as MIT community members.*

This recommendation builds on the tradition of the Hacking Code of Ethics prominently displayed in the Charles M. Vest Student Street of Building 32 (the Stata Center). Calls for

similar statements were discussed in 2014 by the Graduate Student Council, the Committee on Graduate Programs, and the Working Group on Support Staff Issues. Moreover, many universities and corporations have adopted similar approaches to introduce new community members to their organizational culture and norms.

Indeed, one might conclude that MIT already informs community members about institutional values and expectations through its mission statement and its Policies and Procedures and the Mind and Hand Book (these documents apply primarily to employees and students, respectively). However, these documents differ greatly in spirit and content from the proposed Compact. The MIT mission statement describes our institutional goals. Policies and Procedures and the Mind and Hand Book are each a lengthy set of rules. The MIT Compact will be a brief, positive statement of how institutional values enable the MIT mission. It is not a replacement for rules and regulations, but a guide for how to succeed in working with others at MIT. In the spirit of meritocracy and inclusion, I do not present a draft Compact but instead mention in Section 3 some examples and recommend a broadly inclusive process for its construction.

The remainder of the report is a summary of what MIT has already done to advance the ICEO mission and vision, what impediments exist, and what steps can be taken to overcome these impediments.

The history of past efforts to shift the culture can help inform successful future strategies. Sections 4 and 5 summarize 70 years of studies and efforts to advance a respectful and caring community at MIT. In many ways, this report is an extension of the 1998 Report of the Task Force on Student Life and Learning, which emphasized the importance of community alongside teaching and research. MIT's long history of helping community members to manage conflict, of fostering equity and integrity, of embracing diversity, and of practicing "learning by doing good" are reviewed in these central sections as precursors of the current effort.

One difference with the past is today's much greater access to data and analysis methods. Section 6 presents quantitative survey data and qualitative data from interviews that show improving overall satisfaction over the last decade, with some concerns of lower satisfaction for lesbian, bisexual, gay, transgender, and queer (LBGTQ) students and underrepresented minority (Black, Hispanic, and Native American) faculty and undergraduate students. MIT's Quality of Life Survey data are used to construct quantitative measures of community (the local work unit or supervisor creates a "collegial and supportive environment") and equity ("faculty members treat me fairly" or the local work unit's procedures are "fair and equitable to all"). Two-dimensional distributions of these quantities, shown in Figures 4a and b, 5a and b, and 6, show that students generally regard MIT as fair, with some variation in their feelings of how collegial and supportive it is. Faculty, staff, and postdocs have a much broader range of opinions about fairness and collegiality, with significant variation across work units. This variation exceeds differences arising from gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, or national origin. Quotes from community members suggest that much of this variation arises from the supervisor-supervisee relationship, which can cause distress when expectations are unclear or conflicting, or abrasive conduct is present.

Survey data presented in Section 6 show that MIT community members feel high stress, especially undergraduates, faculty, and graduate students, and women compared with men

(Figures 7 and 8). Women at all levels are more likely than men to report being frequently overwhelmed at MIT, even though their overall satisfaction is not less than that of men (Figure 3). The pace and pressure of academic life provide the main source of stress for all students, but international students experience significant additional stress owing to immigration matters. Some stress can be good in energizing people to achieve, but stress becomes harmful when it leads to inappropriate self-doubt or paralysis. This has consequences for equity across gender because female students are more likely than males to underestimate their ability to succeed (Sections 1 and 6) and to experience Impostor Syndrome, which is the feeling that one does not belong and will be revealed to be a fraud, when in fact one is fully capable and deserving. Section 6 concludes with a discussion of micro-aggressions, that is, small acts of bigotry.

Section 7 begins by listing five challenges to the ICEO mission and vision:

- Unconscious bias and micro-inequities
- Discrimination and harassment based on race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.
- Abrasive conduct
- Sexual assault
- Excessive stress

Unconscious bias is the automatic reliance on a stereotype while making judgments or decisions. It is an unavoidable aspect of our humanity. Micro-inequities are small slights against people who are different from oneself, often unintentional and arising from unconscious bias. Discrimination and harassment are deliberate, not unconscious. Abrasive conduct is interpersonal behavior, not necessarily discriminatory, that causes emotional distress in others sufficient to disrupt their functioning. Excessive stress can both arise from and exacerbate any of the other challenges.

These five factors are not specific to students or faculty. They impact all groups. They represent impediments to MIT achieving its full potential. For some people, they are the bane of community and equity at MIT. Therefore, effort is made in the remainder of the report to analyze these factors and to propose remedies to alleviate them.

Section 7 follows with a set of major recommendations (C2 through C6 in Table 1) intended to minimize these five challenges and to empower community members by making *learning by doing* a universal element of the MIT experience and a key symbol of what it means to be at MIT, not only for students, but for everyone.

Recommendation C2 will launch a campaign to educate all community members in the use of bystander intervention techniques and micro-affirmations (the opposite of micro-inequities, these are small positive acts of encouragement and support) to reduce micro-inequities, micro-aggressions, and all forms of misconduct. The campaign will use orientation programs for all new community members (including a new MITx course, Introduction to the MIT Community), facilitated conversations about community standards in each work unit for faculty and supervisory staff, leadership and conflict management workshops, and a bystander intervention video competition.

Recommendation C3 will review, streamline, and update MIT's policies and complaint-handling procedures, including Policies and Procedures, the Personnel Policy Manual, and the Mind and Hand Book. Statistics on formal complaints should be reported annually to the president. All departments and interdisciplinary centers should have faculty trained in conflict management available as informal internal mediators. The existing graduate student mediation program should be extended to include postdocs. MIT should appoint a complaint investigator to handle harassment cases similar to the Title IX investigator.

Recommendation C4 will organize a "business plan" competition for projects that strengthen the MIT community. As with the \$100K Competition, it will offer engagement opportunities with community stakeholders, mentoring, and prizes. This will bring the opportunity of social intrapreneurship (Section 5) to staff, postdocs, students, and faculty, with projects that support the ICEO mission. As with other business plan competitions, teams would pitch a plan to judges, and winning teams would receive mentoring and funding to develop their project.

Recommendation C5 would grant all full-time staff (including research staff and postdocs) an average of two hours per week for professional development and/or community service. This would begin as a one-year randomized trial involving administrative and support staff. Employee time used in this way should be paid. Postdocs, as trainees, should all receive time for professional development.

Recommendation C6 would create a Mentoring Resource Center to provide information, training, and support of mentoring across all sectors of the community, including an online mentoring portal and a blended matching process. The Mentoring Resource Center will have an online and physical presence and will create training modules on MITx. It would begin as a one-year randomized trial involving administrative and support staff.

Section 8 analyzes demographic data to quantify the diversity of our community and to identify challenges that limit our ability to leverage the power of diversity. The most significant challenge demonstrated with data is the relative lack of underrepresented-minority postdocs, research staff, academic staff, and technical staff—that is, a deficit of minority non-faculty PhDs relative to minority faculty. Significant progress has been made in increasing the underrepresented-minority fraction of graduate students and faculty, as called for in a 2004 faculty resolution. Analysis of recruiting and hiring patterns shows that across all schools, proactive recruiting efforts such as encouraging applications from promising minorities have been efficient, in that the proportion of underrepresented-minority faculty hired exceeds the proportion in the applicant pool. By contrast, the proportion of women faculty hired is less than that in the applicant pool of several of MIT's five schools for the five-year period 2009–2013 ( $P < 1$  in Table 7). Finally, the annual AAUP survey of faculty salaries shows that MIT is unique among its peers in having equal average salaries for female and male full professors. These findings motivate three recommendations: E1, E2, and E3.

The full summary set of major recommendations is given in Table 1.

**Table 1. Major recommendations for advancing a respectful and caring community at MIT**

Priority	Community	Equity	Structural
First	<p>C1: Create an MIT Compact</p> <p>C2: Launch an education campaign, employing bystander videos and leadership workshops</p> <p>C3: Policies and complaint-handling procedures</p>	<p>E5: Educate all community members about unconscious bias</p> <p>E4: Implement recommendations of existing faculty equity reports</p>	<p>S1: Create and use a Community and Equity Dashboard</p> <p>S2: Join the Leading for Change Higher Education Diversity Consortium</p>
Second	<p>C5: Implement a paid “Time for Learning and Doing” during work hours program</p> <p>C6: Establish a Mentoring Resource Center</p>	<p>E8: Enhance the MIT MLK programs</p> <p>E6: Consider appointing a faculty recruitment concierge</p> <p>E2: Collect applicant-pool data for all academic and research hires</p>	<p>S3: Appoint Equity Committees</p>
Third	<p>C4: Organize an annual Community and Equity Challenge competition</p>	<p>E1: Increase the URM percentage of non-faculty academics</p> <p>E3: Review salary equity for postdocs and all employee categories</p> <p>E7: Connect the STEM pipeline at MIT</p>	

Recommendation E1 calls for an increase of the underrepresented-minority fraction of postdocs, research staff, academic staff, and Lincoln Laboratory technical staff to match the faculty by 2025, with annual reporting of progress. This will likely require applying similar practices used with faculty searches, e.g., unconscious-bias training and review of search procedures.

Recommendation E2 calls for collection of applicant-pool data for all hires of postdocs, research staff, academic staff, and Lincoln Laboratory technical staff, in addition to faculty, graduate students, and other staff categories. The applicant pool for women and minorities in each category indicated should be compared with the relevant PhD fractions in each discipline, which are available to department heads from the Office of Institutional Research. Targeted recruitment efforts should be made to increase the pipeline ratio for underrepresented groups. When job searches cannot be conducted—for example, when hosting a postdoc with an external fellowship—if the repeated outcome is a set of appointments with much less diversity than exists in the national pool in the field, the reasons need to be understood and any biases corrected.

Recommendation E3 calls for the vice president for human resources to review equity of salaries and other resources for postdocs and all employee categories on the basis of gender, race/ethnicity, LBGTQ (lesbian, bisexual, gay, transgender, or queer or other non-heterosexual) identity, nationality, and ability/disability. A pilot study should first be undertaken for



academic or research staff using the four paired groups shown in Figure 3 of Section 6, e.g., female–male, before expanding to additional employee categories. Differences for the paired groups should also be analyzed for hours worked, employee benefits, rewards and recognitions, office and lab space, leadership positions, committee service, and speaking opportunities such as representation at MIT conferences, colloquia, and seminars.

Section 9 posits that to achieve the benefits of diversity, MIT must increase the representation of underrepresented groups. This calls for several steps that have been identified in previous reports. In particular, it presents five recommendations.

Recommendation E4 calls for deans and department heads to review and implement the recommendations of existing faculty equity reports. These reports made a number of important recommendations that require continued effort, including:

- Strengthen efforts to recruit, mentor, promote, and retain women and minority faculty
- Increase the diversity of MIT graduate student and faculty populations
- Train all search committees about unconscious bias and steps to overcome it
- Appoint women and minorities to leadership positions
- Monitor equity of salaries, recognition and resources, and service commitments
- Take steps to end marginalization and strengthen the culture of inclusion
- Address quality-of-life concerns, including work/family integration
- Implement mechanisms to monitor success and ensure accountability

To support monitoring and accountability, the provost should review progress toward the goals of the faculty equity reports every five years, starting in 2015.

Recommendation E5 seeks to educate all community members about unconscious bias, even beyond the recommendations of previous faculty equity reports. The reason for calling on everyone to learn about this is that new research findings show that faculty of both genders tend to disfavor female applicants who are equally strong as male applicants, and students in an online subject give lower course evaluations to female-named instructors than to the same instructor with a male name (references are given in Section 9). Departments should use search procedures that correct unconscious bias. MIT should recruit a social scientist to implement training programs. MIT should educate its community about unconscious bias as thoroughly as Google and the University of Wisconsin-Madison have educated their employees.

Recommendation E6 suggests considering the appointment of a faculty recruitment concierge to assist department heads and deans with retention and recruitment of dual career couples.

Recommendation E7 calls for connecting the STEM pipeline at MIT, starting with existing K–12 efforts, to help us reduce the underrepresentation of women and minorities. This has been mentioned in previous reports, but we are now better prepared to do it, as discussed in Section 9.

Recommendation E8 calls for increasing faculty awareness of and participation in the MLK programs (annual Leadership Awards, MLK celebration, 17.922 MLK Design Seminar, MLK Inspired Art and Performance Contest, MLK Visiting Professors and Scholars Program). In addition, it calls for a three-year pilot MLK postdoctoral fellowship program.

Section 10 provides a perspective on the ICEO role and presents a final set of structural recommendations, which facilitate the other recommendations.

Recommendation S1 asks the Office of Institutional Research to create and periodically update a Community and Equity (CE) Dashboard displaying the types of demographic and climate data presented in this report, and any other data that may be helpful in assessing progress toward the goals of this report. There should be a public MIT-wide version of this dashboard, and a private version for each department or other work unit. The CE Dashboard will extend MIT's leadership and openness into the realm of quantifying the culture and diversity of our community.

Recommendation S2 calls for MIT to join the Leading for Change Higher Education Diversity Consortium, a statewide group of colleges and universities that agrees to share the kinds of data that will be included in the CE Dashboard. In addition, consortium members share best practices in promoting equity and inclusion. Consortium membership aligns well with our efforts to “advance a respectful and caring community that embraces diversity and empowers everyone to learn and do their best.” Joining the consortium will help us learn from promising practices at colleges not normally considered our peers, and will help other campuses adopt our successful innovations in equity and inclusion.

Recommendation S3 would appoint a series of Equity Committees to help carry out this report's recommendations E1 through E8. There will be one Equity Committee for each of the five schools, and in addition one each for the deans for undergraduate education, graduate education, student life, and digital learning; the vice presidents for research, resource development, human resources, information systems and technology, and finance; and the directors of the MIT Libraries and Lincoln Laboratory. The Equity Committee Chairs will work with the ICEO and others to uniformly implement the equity recommendations of Sections 8 and 9.

Section 10 prioritizes all major recommendations, discusses some implementation issues, and discusses some requirements for organizational change to succeed, in the context of the MIT Compact. The ability to establish trust and respect within a representative task force will be critical to the success of this effort. The Task Force on the MIT Compact will be the proving ground of the whole framework by empowering itself as a body that learns and does its best. Section 10 concludes with a view forward to a future where MIT has created a culture so distinct from the surrounding society that we must teach every new generation of students not only new ways of thinking, but new ways of learning, doing, and being.

The main body of the report is followed by two appendices. Appendix 1 gives background to the creation of the ICEO role. Appendix 2 collects all of the major recommendations and a corresponding set of minor recommendations.

This report will have succeeded if, in the year 2030, a journalist can write:

During the first three decades of this century, MIT has become the leading institution developing the talent of its community members for the betterment of humankind. Known originally as a foundry of ideas and technology, and later as an incubator of new businesses, MIT is now the premier institution developing and applying talent from all quarters to address the world's great challenges using its famous "learning by doing, with caring and respect" approach to collaborative problem solving by students, postdocs, staff, and faculty. Many universities have adopted their own versions of the MIT Compact as a means to advance their communities in service. Besides brilliance and invention, the words most often used to describe MIT include community, diversity, empowerment, and respect.



## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This appendix summarizes 17 major recommendations, as well as the many minor recommendations scattered throughout the text. The recommendations are organized into three categories: Community (C), Equity (E), and Structural (S). The major recommendations are listed in Table 1 in the Executive Summary.

### Major community recommendations

#### **Recommendation C1: Create an MIT Compact**

*Assemble a representative working group to write a brief statement of what we aspire to as a community and what we expect of one another as MIT community members.*

1. Convene a highly diverse community-wide Task Force on the MIT Compact (TFMC). The Task Force should be co-chaired by staff and faculty members and provided with adequate staff support, including one or more facilitators skilled in intergroup dialogue.
2. The Task Force should represent and gather input from graduate students, undergraduate students, Lincoln Laboratory employees, administrative staff, visiting faculty and scholars, support staff, postdocs, research staff, faculty, other academic staff, and service staff.
3. Charge the TFMC with writing a ≤ 300-word statement considering core values, community aspirations, and norms.
4. The TFMC gathers input from all stakeholders, including community forums, governance structures, and advisory groups (e.g., Faculty Policy Committee, Committee on Student Life, Undergraduate Association, Graduate Student Council, Postdoctoral Association, Council on Staff Diversity and Inclusion, Working Group on Support Staff Issues, union representatives, and ad hoc groups of research and other academic staff).
5. The MIT president and chair of the MIT Corporation commence a ratification process.
6. A working group convenes to oversee implementation.
7. Make the Compact a living document by repeating the Task Force process every four years.

#### **Recommendation C2: Launch an education campaign, employing bystander videos and leadership workshops**

*Launch a campaign to educate all community members in the use of bystander interventions and micro-affirmations to reduce micro-inequities, micro-aggressions, and all forms of misconduct. The campaign will use orientation programs for all community members, leadership and conflict management workshops, and a bystander intervention video competition.*

1. Conduct a Bystander Intervention Video Competition (monthly YouTube skits).
2. Produce and deliver an MITx course, Introduction to the MIT Community.
3. Facilitate conversations about community standards in each department, lab, and center (DLC) for all faculty and supervisory staff.
4. Encourage every DLC head, administrative officer, and equivalent to attend a leadership workshop and take a four-hour online course such as ILX1 on the edX platform.
5. Provide every DLC head with conflict management training, paying the tuition when needed, e.g., for Crucial Conversations by VitalSmarts.<sup>1</sup>
6. Assess the effectiveness of these leadership orientation activities using surveys and by conducting exit interviews with DLC heads when they step down.

### **Recommendation C3: Review and update policies and complaint-handling procedures**

*MIT's policies and complaint-handling procedures should be reviewed and updated as needed. An investigator for formal complaints should be appointed.*

1. The president should appoint an ad hoc group to review, streamline, and update Policies and Procedures, the Personnel Policy Manual, and the Mind and Hand Book so that they are consistent with one another. The group should consider adding language about bullying or abrasive conduct.
2. Statistics on formal complaints should be reported annually to the president.
3. All DLCs should have faculty internal mediators.
4. The REFS program should be extended to include postdocs.
5. MIT should appoint a complaint investigator similar to the Title IX investigator.

### **Recommendation C4: Organize an annual Community and Equity Challenge competition**

*Organize a "business plan" competition for projects that strengthen the MIT community. As with the \$100K Competition, offer engagement opportunities with community stakeholders, mentoring, and prizes.*

1. Organize the Community and Equity Challenge to bring the opportunity of social intrapreneurship to staff, postdocs, students, and faculty, with projects that advance a respectful and caring community.
2. As with other business plan competitions, teams would pitch a plan to judges, and winning teams would be provided mentoring and funding to develop their project.
3. This competition could be organized for a three-year trial period by experienced groups such as the Innovation Initiative or Public Service Center.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.vital-smarts.com/>; the training is based on the book by K. Patterson, J. Grenny, R. McMillan, and A. Switzler, *Crucial Conversations: Tools for Talking When Stakes Are High* (McGraw-Hill, 2011).

**Recommendation C5: Implement a paid “Time for Learning and Doing” during work hours program**

*Grant all full-time staff (including research staff and postdocs) two hours per week for professional development and/or community service.*

1. Through a collaboration between Sloan faculty and the Human Resources (HR) Department, conduct a one-year randomized trial of a Time for Learning and Doing program with administrative and support staff. Assess the outcomes on employee and supervisor satisfaction and productivity before considering expanding to other employee categories.
2. Employee time used in this way should be paid, and counted in performance review.
3. Postdocs, as trainees, should all receive time for professional development.

**Recommendation C6: Establish a Mentoring Resource Center**

*Establish a small work unit to provide information, training, and support of mentoring across all sectors of the community, including an online mentoring portal and a blended matching process.*

1. The Mentoring Resource Center should be co-sponsored with HR and be staffed by a dedicated mentoring coordinator, who will develop a blended approach to mentor matching.
2. The Mentoring Resource Center will have an online and physical presence and will create training modules on MITx.
3. To assess the benefits of mentoring, the Mentoring Resource Center will conduct a one-year randomized trial with administrative and support staff, in collaboration with Sloan faculty and HR, and assess outcomes on employee and supervisor satisfaction and productivity.

**Minor community recommendations**

1. Give a biannual award luncheon with the president, chancellor, or chairman of the Corporation to honor student groups for exemplary contributions to community, service, and leadership. This would both honor students and provide MIT’s senior leadership with valuable insight into student culture and activities.
2. Encourage faculty and students to engage outside the classroom on Career Fair Day, for example by collaborating in community-building activities that day.
3. Create a “time bank” for exchange of services using a commitment of time.
4. Provide coaching to faculty and other supervisors engaging in abrasive conduct.
5. Change the description of the Personal Assistance Program in Section 7.4.4 of Policies and Procedures so that it is not seen as punitive. Consider, as an alternative, a comprehensive Employee Assistance Program.
6. Create a presidential-level standing committee on mental health and wellness, and solicit student feedback on mental health services.

7. Explore options to provide more uniform family and medical leave for all non-faculty employees, postdocs, and graduate students, and to increase scholarship funds available for childcare. Fundraising for these efforts should be part of MIT's capital campaign.
8. In all new buildings, provide lactation rooms and gender-neutral single-occupancy restrooms. In addition, building plans should also consider reserving funds to be used for childcare, either in the form of new sites added to the Technology Childcare Centers, or scholarship funds made available to the MIT community. MIT's Percent for Art program could be duplicated to create a Percent for Family-Friendly Facilities program.
9. Instruct DLC heads and administrative officers to be open to employees' requests for flexible work arrangements, and provide them with examples of successful arrangements so they are aware of the mutual benefits.
10. During the hiring/onboarding process, inform every employee of the options for flexible work arrangements, both on a regular basis and in the event of major life events.
11. Increase faculty participation in the annual Institute Diversity Summit.
12. Consider establishing a multicultural center to include the Black Students' Union, the Rainbow Lounge, the Latino Cultural Center, a women's center, an Asian Student Center, a Native American Student Center, the International Students Office, and an office for the First Generation Program.
13. Increase staffing support for LBGTQ students.
14. Encourage MIT students to explore subjects in social justice. Social justice and ethics could be added as a field of concentration in the HASS Requirement.

### Major equity recommendations

#### **Recommendation E1: Increase the URM percentage of non-faculty academics**

*Set a goal to approximately equalize the percentage of underrepresented-minority (URM) postdocs, academic staff, research staff, and Lincoln Laboratory technical staff with that of the faculty by 2025, and report progress annually.*

1. Those who recruit and hire research scientists and technical staff at all ranks, postdocs, lecturers, senior lecturers, instructors, technical instructors, and coaches should review their recruiting practices and consider implementing the procedures used for faculty searches.
2. MIT's Affirmative Action Plan should be reviewed for further understanding of the responsibilities assigned and the procedures developed to carry out the Institute's Equal Opportunity policy.
3. Training should be given on unconscious bias and search procedures to everyone hiring in these employment categories, including postdocs, and recruitment summaries should be reported annually to the ICEO and provost by the relevant senior officers, e.g., school dean, vice president for research (for some postdocs and sponsored research staff), or vice president for human resources.
4. MIT should improve its diversity to approach or equal that of the tech industry.



**Recommendation E2: Collect applicant-pool data for all academic and research hires**

*Departments, labs, and centers should collect and analyze application data for postdocs, research staff, academic staff, and Lincoln Laboratory technical staff, in addition to faculty, graduate students, and other staff categories.*

1. The applicant pool for women and minorities in each category indicated should be compared with the relevant PhD fractions in each discipline, which are available to department heads from the Office of Institutional Research. Targeted recruitment efforts should be made to increase the pipeline ratio for underrepresented groups.
2. Where searches cannot be conducted—for example, a postdoc with an external fellowship—it the repeated outcome is a set of appointments with much less diversity than exists in the national pool in the field, the reasons need to be understood and any biases corrected.

**Recommendation E3: Review salary equity for postdocs and all employee categories**

*The vice president for human resources should analyze data on salaries and other resources to ensure equity on the basis of gender, race/ethnicity, LBGTQ identity, nationality, and ability/disability for postdocs as well as all employee categories.*

1. A pilot study of differences in satisfaction among the MIT community should be undertaken for academic or research staff using the paired groups (e.g., female–male, URM–White/Asian, heterosexual–LBGTQ, and US–international). If gaps are found, this would provide impetus for expanding to additional employee groups.
2. Differences for these four paired groups should also be analyzed for hours worked, employee benefits, rewards and recognitions, office and lab space, leadership positions, committee service, and speaking opportunities such as representation at MIT conferences, colloquia, and seminars.

**Recommendation E4: Implement recommendations of existing faculty equity reports**

*New deans and department heads should review and implement recommendations of existing faculty equity reports.<sup>2</sup> The provost should review progress every five years, starting in 2015.*

1. Department heads should review with their dean annually what they are doing to implement the recommendations of these reports.

**Recommendation E5: Educate all community members about unconscious bias**

*Every community member should become aware of unconscious bias and methods to reveal and correct it, starting with the Implicit Association Test.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>2</sup> Reports of the Committees on the Status of Women Faculty (March 2002), Report on the Initiative for Faculty Race and Diversity (February 2010), Report on the Special Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure Processes (June 2010), and A Report on the Status of Women Faculty in the Schools of Science and Engineering (March 2011), all available at <http://web.mit.edu/faculty/reports/index.html>.

<sup>3</sup> The universality of unconscious bias is easily demonstrated via the Implicit Association Test, which can be done online at <http://implicit.harvard.edu/>. An excellent popular account is M. R. Banaji and A. G. Greenwald, *Blind Spot: Hidden Biases of Good People* (Delacorte Press, 2013).

1. All departments should use a guide to search procedures indicating ways to correct unconscious bias such as the MIT Faculty Search Committee Handbook.<sup>4</sup> This handbook should be updated.
2. MIT should recruit an expert social scientist trained in one of the leading groups working on unconscious bias and its correction, to implement an Institute-wide workshop for all current faculty and other supervisors and hiring managers and assess the outcomes.
3. Workshops should be offered annually for new employees and for search committee members, who should receive periodic refreshers.

#### **Recommendation E6: Consider appointing a faculty recruitment concierge**

*Consider appointing a faculty concierge to assist department heads and deans with dual career recruitment and retention.*

1. The provost should canvass deans and department heads for their needs, investigate the approaches followed by other universities, and assess the costs and benefits of creating a faculty concierge service to assist department heads with faculty hiring and retention. The concierge could be a faculty member or a staff member, and could take advantage of programming offered by the MIT Work-Life Center.

#### **Recommendation E7: Connect the STEM pipeline at MIT**

*Charge a working group to assess the impact of K-12 STEM outreach efforts, communicate their value to MIT, and propose ways to increase that value.*

1. This recommendation is closely related to Recommendation 9 of the Institute-wide Task Force on the Future of MIT Education, which will establish an Initiative for Educational Innovation. Therefore, the MIT Outreach Working Group should carry out Recommendation E7 in consultation with the special interest group within the Initiative for Educational Innovation, and with the MIT Alumni Association K-12 STEM working group.

#### **Recommendation E8: Enhance the MIT MLK programs**

*Increase the visibility of and MIT faculty participation in the MLK programs. Add an MLK Postdoctoral Program modeled on the MLK Visiting Professors and Scholars Program.*

1. The Institute should continue to value and support the annual MLK Leadership Awards, MLK Celebration, 17.922 MLK Design Seminar, MLK Inspired Art and Performance Contest, and MLK Visiting Professors and Scholars Program and strive to increase faculty awareness of and involvement in them.
2. MIT should fund a three-year pilot program of postdoctoral fellowships, with nominations provided by MIT faculty and with the fellows hosted by MIT departments, similarly to the MLK visiting professors and scholars. This pilot would support three two-year postdocs starting in fall 2015 and fall 2016, after which the program will be evaluated. If the program continues, then in a steady state six postdocs will be in residence at any time, or more if departments provide funding for a third year.

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://orgchart.mit.edu/sites/default/files/reports/20020101\\_Provost\\_Search\\_Comm.Handbookt8.pdf](http://orgchart.mit.edu/sites/default/files/reports/20020101_Provost_Search_Comm.Handbookt8.pdf)

## Minor equity recommendation

1. More departments should adopt recruiting strategies similar to the Dow–MIT ACCESS Program in the Departments of Chemical Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering, and Chemistry; the Women in Aerospace Symposium of the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics and the Department of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences; and the annual Rising Stars in EECS Conference.

## Major structural recommendations

### **Recommendation S1: Create and use a Community and Equity Dashboard**

*The Office of Institutional Research should prepare and periodically update a Community and Equity (CE) Dashboard for MIT as a whole and for each academic department using data to show progress toward the goals of this report. Department heads should discuss this progress annually with their dean. Visiting Committees should be provided, and requested to comment on, the CE Dashboard and plans for their unit.*

### **Recommendation S2: Join the Leading for Change Higher Education Diversity Consortium**

*The Leading for Change Higher Education Diversity Consortium is a statewide group of colleges and universities that agree to share the kind of data that will be included in the public CE dashboard. In addition, Consortium members share best practices in promoting equity and inclusion. Joining the Consortium will help us learn from promising practices at colleges not normally considered our peers, and it will let us help other campuses adopt our successful innovations in equity and inclusion. The initial focus of the Consortium's efforts will be on the success of first-generation and underrepresented minority students.*

### **Recommendation S3: Appoint equity committees**

*Appoint an Equity Committee in each of the five schools, and in addition one each for the deans for undergraduate education, graduate education, student life, and digital learning; the vice presidents for research, resource development, human resources, information systems and technology, and finance; and the directors, the Libraries and Lincoln Laboratory. The equity committee chairs will work with the ICEO and others to uniformly implement this report's equity recommendations.*

1. Faculty and staff knowledgeable about and committed to diversity and inclusion can support MIT's distributed leadership.
2. Dean/VP/Director will give committee a charge with relevant area focus.
3. Equity committee chairs will work with ICEO and the Human Resources Department to implement equity recommendations.

## Minor structural recommendations

1. The incoming vice president for human resources and the Office of Institutional Research should study the Google methodology, including its Googlegeist annual employee survey, to learn how we can improve employee engagement, satisfaction, and retention.

2. The Council on Family and Work should analyze the Faculty and Staff Quality of Life Survey data in a manner similar to Harvard's Faculty Climate Survey<sup>5</sup> but extended to all employee groups.
3. The Office of Institutional Research should periodically review the questions used in the Quality of Life Survey and other surveys to find which questions are most useful in categorizing the data using clustering algorithms and other data-mining tools, and prune the surveys of questions that do not have significant discriminatory power.
4. Add the item "People in my department/DLC are treated with civility and respect" to the Quality of Life Surveys.

---

<sup>5</sup> Harvard climate survey results for faculty, and comparison with its peers, are summarized at [http://www.faculty.harvard.edu/Faculty\\_Climate\\_Survey\\_2013](http://www.faculty.harvard.edu/Faculty_Climate_Survey_2013).