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Abstract

As data on the benefits of faculty diversity accrue, colleges and universities have worked toward this goal. However, faculty racial demographics have not changed significantly for many institutions. Many campus interventions seek to increase faculty diversity through hiring. Yet it is critical for colleges and universities to add faculty retention strategies to their broader efforts around faculty diversity for more significant changes to occur. From our internal data, and as part of our work with the University of Michigan ADVANCE Program, we identified four areas of intervention to improve the retention of faculty of color: climate, evaluation processes, leadership opportunities, and service equity. We then developed yearlong workshop programming for chairs and unit leaders to help them build a toolbox around organizational change to improve faculty retention. Based on our experiences, we offer the three strategies to promote institutional change in this area: 1) use data to identify challenges and make a compelling argument; 2) frame retention as preemptive; and 3) focus on both individual and structural change strategies. We hope these recommendations are useful to others engaged in institutional change efforts on their campus and can lead to meaningful improvements in faculty diversity across institutions.
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As the data on the benefits of increasing faculty diversity accrue (Gonzales, 2018; Hunt et al., 2018; Llamas et al., 2021), many colleges and universities have made it a priority, often focusing their intervention efforts on increasing hiring of faculty from marginalized groups. Nevertheless, faculty demographics have not changed significantly for many institutions (Griffin, 2019), especially for so-called underrepresented racially minoritized (URM) faculty – those who are Black, Latinx, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Native American/Alaska Native. At the University of Michigan (U-M), 20 years of workshops on equitable faculty recruitment strategies for search committee members conducted by the U-M ADVANCE Program (a unit focused on increasing the diversity and success of faculty on campus) have resulted in numerical hiring gains for women and faculty of color, including URM faculty. However, the overall percentage of URM faculty on the tenure-track remains around 11%. Analysis of our institutional data indicates that faculty who are Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color (BIPOC), and especially URM faculty, choose to leave the university at a greater rate than White faculty in recent years (U-M ADVANCE Program, 2019).

To make significant increases in the number of BIPOC (and especially URM) faculty, we identified a critical need to improve not only faculty hiring but also faculty retention. To meet this need, we identified three strategies, grounded in the research literature, that could promote institutional change in this area: 1) use data to identify challenges and make a compelling argument; 2) frame retention as preemptive; and 3) focus on both individual and structural change strategies. We implemented these strategies in a workshop series we developed for university leaders on BIPOC faculty retention in 2021-2022. In this paper, we share these three
strategies, with examples from our workshop series, for engaging campus leaders in BIPOC faculty retention efforts. These strategies, and the challenges to which we apply them, reflect our application of the synthesized research literature on faculty experiences. We hope these strategies can be useful to others engaged in faculty diversity and institutional change efforts on their campus.

In our BIPOC faculty retention efforts, we identified department chairs and other unit leaders (directors and, in the smaller units, associate deans) as our primary audience, but we welcomed participation from other university leaders (e.g., associate chairs, deans). This decision was based on our conversations with the Provost and the deans of U-M’s 19 schools and colleges, which indicated that chairs are the critical change agents in this work. Similarly, the literature identifies chairs as academic leaders with the formal power to profoundly influence departmental climate and culture; they are leaders among peers, with a unique positionality to connect both up and down the organizational ladder (Bystydzienski et al., 2017; Kezar, 2018; Kezar & Posselt, 2019; Stewart & Valian, 2018). Moreover, chairs are often the first point of contact in a retention situation, and failure to retain faculty in their unit places additional strain on teaching and service responsibilities. Yet, most chairs and unit leaders have received little or no instruction in organizational change, generally, or retention strategies, specifically (Floyd, 2016). To address this need, we envisioned the workshop series as helping unit leaders and chairs build a toolbox around organizational change to improve faculty retention.

**Strategy #1: Use Data to Identify Challenges and Make a Compelling Argument**

Data are an important tool for organizational change efforts. In our BIPOC faculty retention change efforts, we used data in two ways: to identify the specific types of challenges
that BIPOC faculty experience on our campus that have contributed to their departure and to make a compelling argument for specific changes and interventions.

**Use Data to Identify Challenges**

National data have documented the negative experiences of BIPOC faculty, such as racial discrimination, microaggressions, and multiple types of exclusion (Chesler & Young Jr, 2015; Settles et al., 2019; Turner et al., 2008; Zambrana et al., 2017; Zimmerman et al., 2016), as well as the psychological and workplace consequences of such experiences (Eagan & Garvey, 2015; Settles et al., 2021). Such data point to possible reasons for BIPOC faculty departure; however, interventions may be more effective when they can be paired with more local institutional data.

In our faculty retention efforts, we were able to draw upon three sources of internal data collected by the U-M ADVANCE Program: informal focus groups with BIPOC faculty as well as department chairs and associate deans to understand more about the issues surrounding retention of BIPOC faculty (U-M ADVANCE Program, 2021); a campus-wide climate survey conducted in 2017 (U-M ADVANCE Program, 2018); and ongoing exit interviews that we conduct with tenured and tenure-track faculty who choose to leave the university for other employment (U-M ADVANCE Program, 2020). From these sources of data, we identified four primary challenges that could be addressed institutionally by chairs and other unit leaders. Notably, these U-M specific challenges mirror national data, and thus may be useful points of intervention at many colleges and universities.

First, BIPOC faculty engage in service (e.g., mentoring students, emotional labor in the classroom, DEI activities) that is often invisible to leadership and colleagues. They care deeply about their service work and giving back; yet they see this service as uncompensated and not counting towards promotion and tenure (U-M ADVANCE Program, 2021); see also Joseph &
Hirshfield, 2011). Second, BIPOC faculty perceive a lack of leadership opportunities, especially in roles with a high impact and the ability to effect institutional change (U-M ADVANCE Program, 2021; see also Quinteros & Covarrubias, 2023). Third, faculty experience structural inequities related to evaluation processes, including biases in teaching evaluations and feeling unrecognized and devalued for their expertise (U-M ADVANCE Program, 2021; see also Bavishi et al., 2010; Settles et al., 2021). Fourth, BIPOC faculty describe poor climates in their departments, including rating the climate as less collegial, respectful, friendly, and supportive than White faculty (U-M ADVANCE Program, 2018, 2021). Notably, in exit interviews (U-M ADVANCE Program, 2020), we learned that BIPOC faculty were more likely than White faculty to suggest improving the climate as a means of improving retention (see also Griffin et al., 2011). These various findings formed the basis of our model of four areas of intervention to improve BIPOC faculty retention at U-M (see Figure 1).

**Figure 1**

*Four Areas for Intervention to Improve BIPOC Faculty Retention*
We used this model to guide the development of our four interactive workshops and one panel discussion (see Supplemental Tables S1-S5 for details on session content, interactive elements, and key strategies). The workshop on *New Findings and Strategies for Faculty Retention* (see Table S1) provided an overview of the problem that led us to develop the workshop series, shared internal data about BIPOC faculty retention, introduced our framing to campus leaders, and started the discussion of leadership opportunities. The workshop on *Individual and Structural Bias in Evaluation Processes* (see Table S2) focused on raising awareness about the ways that bias creeps into evaluation processes, with a particular focus on bias related to scholarship and teaching. The workshop on *Service Inequity and Invisible Service* (see Table S3) detailed unequal service demands experienced by BIPOC faculty, especially around invisible service, and connections between service and leadership. The workshop on *Cultivating a Climate for Faculty Equity* (see Table S4) drew on the existing efforts of the ADVANCE Program’s RISE (Respect in Striving for Excellence) Committee, composed of senior faculty and staff, to improve the climate for faculty on campus by focusing on climate tied specifically to BIPOC faculty experiences. Finally, the *Panel Discussion on Preemptive Retention* (see Table S5) provided leaders with ideas for how to retain BIPOC faculty based on the experiences of other campus leaders with success in this area.

**Use Data to Make a Compelling Argument**

In our workshops, we made the case for addressing each topic (e.g., teaching evaluation bias) using national data, and where available, internal data. Using data is a way to help participants gain a deeper awareness of the specific workshop topic and can convince skeptics that the problem is real. For example, in the workshop on *Individual and Structural Bias in Evaluation Processes* (see Table S2), we discussed the body of literature on bias in teaching
evaluations, which finds that instructors from marginalized groups are evaluated more negatively than White instructors (Bavishi et al., 2010; Reid, 2010; Subtirelu, 2015; U-M ADVANCE Program, 2015). Additionally, we shared the literature detailing that BIPOC faculty are more likely than White faculty to report negative classroom interactions such as open challenges to their authority and expertise (Chesler & Young, Jr., 2007; Harlow, 2003; Semlak & Pearson, 2008). We described the additional labor in which BIPOC faculty engage to preempt these types of classroom challenges, such as detailing their credentials (to establish credibility), over-preparation (to establish expertise), and setting clear expectations and boundaries (to establish authority).

As another example, in our Service Inequity and Invisible Service workshop (see Table S3), we shared data on how service inequity manifests such that BIPOC faculty, across women and men, spend more time mentoring and on diversity-related service (Babcock et al., 2018; Jimenez et al., 2019; Misra et al, 2010; O’Meara et al., 2021). We also described three domains of invisible service: special requests, or engaging in tasks for students and colleagues outside of official teaching/service responsibilities (El-Alayli et al., 2018; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011); care work, or providing emotional support to students and/or colleagues, and other activities that help to make the institution or academy “a better place” (El-Alayli et al., 2018; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011); and cultural taxation, or various types of identity-based service expectations (Baez, 2000; Eagan & Garvey, 2015; Griffin et al., 2011; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011). By providing data, we aimed to ensure that participants understood the challenge for BIPOC faculty and could, if needed, make the case to their colleagues as part of their institutional change efforts.

**Strategy #2: Frame Retention as Preemptive**
Many people think about retention as something that happens when a faculty member has an offer from another university. But data indicate that not all faculty members are willing or able to take the time required to interview elsewhere and negotiate a counter-offer, nor are all faculty members equally likely to receive counter-offers (COACHE, 2017; O’Meara et al., 2017). Both national data and our internal data suggest that once faculty members have an outside offer, it is often too late to retain them because they have lessened their commitment to the institution during the process of interviewing and imagining themselves elsewhere (O’Meara, 2015; U-M ADVANCE Program, 2021). Importantly, our internal data also revealed that a faculty member’s decision to leave is typically a gradual process, providing leaders the time and opportunity to intervene before an outside offer is in hand (U-M ADVANCE Program, 2020).

For these reasons, we framed our workshops around the notion of preemptive retention—efforts that begin from the start of the faculty member’s employment—as the optimal approach to retaining BIPOC faculty members. Preemptive retention includes work to develop faculty careers, remove structural barriers, identify and address areas of unequal impact, and address climate issues to create an environment where all faculty can flourish and be valued. Importantly, such preemptive retention work allows campus leaders to build on areas that faculty see as existing institutional strengths while also addressing areas of concern.

Although the notion of preemptive retention resonated with campus leaders, we felt they might not have clear ideas about how to implement this approach. Consequently, our panel discussion with campus leaders (department chairs and college deans, moderated by the Chief Diversity Officer at U-M) focused on three stages at which leaders can think about creating favorable conditions for retention: before the hire, once a faculty member is hired (and before they go on the job market or entertain other targeted recruitment attempts), and the point at
which a faculty member has an outside offer. For example, prior to a hire, panelists noted that leaders can continuously improve the climate of their units, engage in best practices around faculty hiring, and recognize the different paths individuals may travel to arrive at their current position. Once a faculty member is hired, strategies include finding ways to recognize faculty contributions, ensuring that faculty feel valued, creating structures for service equity, and identifying opportunities for leadership development. Once a faculty member has an outside offer, leaders can use it to understand the aspects of the job that are desirable but potentially missing at their current institution and then identify ways to meet those needs (e.g., connecting the faculty member to networks or resources). Panelist suggestions often addressed the four areas of intervention in our model to improve BIPOC faculty retention at U-M: climate, evaluation processes, leadership opportunities, and service. Moreover, although strategies for developing a counter-offer often focused on individual-level solutions (e.g., salary, resources, teaching load for that faculty member), the development of preemptive conditions were often focused on structural approaches (e.g., improving the climate, structures for service equity) that would benefit many faculty.

Strategy #3: Focus on Both Individual and Structural Change Strategies

Shifting retention from a focus on developing effective counter-offers that permit the retention of individual faculty members to preemptive conditions that support BIPOC and other faculty and increase their desire to stay underscores the need for structural interventions. Scholars have documented how individual discretion, such as chairs making case-by-case decisions about faculty retention counter-offers, often produces biased outcomes that reproduce inequality (O’Meara, 2021). Moreover, conceptualizing colleges and universities as racialized organizations—i.e., those in which beliefs about race shape policies, practices, and the
distribution of resources—reinforces the need to develop equity-focused policies and practices, or structural solutions that are less subject to individual discretion (O’Meara, 2021; Ray, 2019). With this in mind, our BIPOC faculty retention efforts included working with chairs to center racial inequity and anti-racism in their organizational change efforts, and to consider structural interventions that could help retain many BIPOC faculty.

For example, our workshop on *Service Inequity and Invisible Service* (see Table S3) described the limitations of the often-touted advice to early-career faculty to “just say no” to service requests; this individual-level solution merely shifts service demands onto other faculty and may undermine the faculty member’s personal values and service goals (e.g., to mentor students of color). We introduced the American Council on Education and the Faculty Workload and Rewards Project’s six recommended approaches (transparency, clarity, credit, norms, context, and accountability) as an alternative strategy that, together, could help units work toward a systemic solution to service inequities (O’Meara et al., 2021). We focused on these recommended structural approaches because research by O’Meara and colleagues (2018, 2019) found that their use increased faculty satisfaction, commitment, and productivity.

For our workshop on *Cultivating a Climate for Faculty Equity* (see Table S4), we provided eight levers to shift climate for respect and inclusion; these are levers that can be “pulled” to improve the climate. They are inspired by Ron Ritchhart and Harvard’s Project Zero’s work on cultures of thinking (Ritchhart, 2015). The U-M ADVANCE Program’s RISE Committee adapted the framework for the higher education employment context (U-M ADVANCE Program’s RISE Committee, 2020). Some of these levers are well-suited for addressing problematic individual behavior; for example, the “Interaction” lever focuses on how people treat each other interpersonally (e.g., questioning an inappropriate comment made at a
faculty meeting). However, most levers can be used to structurally improve the climate. For example, the “Routines and Structures” lever focuses on how policies and practices affect the climate and could be used to develop anti-racist hiring or retention practices, whereas the “Language” lever focuses on how words can create belonging or exclusion and could be used to shift the inaccurate but common discourse around sacrificing excellence for diversity.

**Conclusion**

The impact of our workshop series on faculty retention will be the result of sustained efforts to be assessed some years hence. Yet a shorter-term impact is that leaders have received in-depth training on what it means to lead with an equity mindset and to frame retention as an ongoing project that begins as soon as new faculty start their careers at the university. Indeed, we are seeing discussion of (and early stages in the implementation of) strategies for service equity across multiple schools and colleges as well as conversations around evaluating scholarship outside of the traditional “center” of the field (e.g., engaged scholarship). Our ADVANCE Program is receiving additional requests for our workshops on faculty retention, along with requests for unit climate surveys. We have seen an increase in internet traffic to our climate case studies (U-M ADVANCE Program’s RISE Committee, 2022), which offer examples of how to use the eight levers to shift climate in different contexts, and we have summarized ten strategies for BIPOC faculty retention from the workshops in a widely circulated document (Linderman et al., 2022).

Although our model of four areas of intervention to improve BIPOC faculty retention (i.e., climate, evaluation processes, leadership opportunities, service equity) was specific to the challenges we identified at U-M, national data suggest that these may be relevant areas at other institutions and offer a starting point for likely areas of intervention. In our experience delivering
our workshops, anecdotal experiences were often consistent with the research literature, such as faculty experiences of bias and inequity related to teaching, scholarship, and service. Further, we believe the three strategies we identified—using data to identify challenges and make a compelling argument; framing retention as preemptive; and focusing on both individual and structural change strategies—can be employed for other types of interventions beyond workshops. For example, individuals might opt to structurally improve BIPOC faculty retention through policy changes. In doing so, they would want to use institutional data to understand why BIPOC faculty are leaving as well as identify policies resulting in inequitable outcomes for BIPOC faculty. A focus on preemptive retention would place attention on policies unrelated to negotiation of the counter-offer. For faculty members seeking to make changes within their units, the strategies can be effective ways to gather support from colleagues and, along with the model, offer specific areas for intervention. Although our areas of intervention and strategies were informed by higher education literature related to faculty experiences, we identified that preemptive retention had the smallest research foundation despite having a significant potential for impacting retention; this disconnect suggests that this is an apt area for future study.
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Table S1

New Findings and Strategies for Faculty Retention

Core Content
- Overview of national and university level data relevant to faculty retention, particularly BIPOC faculty retention (e.g., climate surveys, exit interviews)
- Discussion of challenges to BIPOC faculty retention
- Discussion of strategies and areas for future work
- Identification of the critical role that unit leaders play in retaining faculty

Interactive Elements: Small group discussion followed by report-out

Discussion about Challenges
- What are the challenges that faculty, especially BIPOC faculty, face that may contribute to retention concerns?

Discussion about Leadership
- How can you identify or create leadership opportunities, both formal and informal, especially for BIPOC faculty? What role does mentoring play in leadership development?

Discussion about Recognition
- What are strategies to enhance faculty recognition, both formal and informal? How can we communicate to faculty that we value them? How do you navigate this differently for BIPOC faculty?

Key Challenges and Strategies: Generated by workshop participants

Challenges Identified
- Invisible service
- Feelings of isolation and lack of community
- Lack of need for mentoring
- Devaluation of scholarship
- Poor climate
- Lack of respect in the classroom

Leadership Strategies
- Assess service and leadership within the unit to identify existing inequities
- Develop leaders through mentoring, training, and coaching
- Make leadership opportunities more transparent (e.g., asking for self-nominations) rather than choosing from one’s informal networks

Recognition Strategies
- Develop awards to acknowledge important work
- Form committees charged with award nominations
- Recognize high levels of service and mentoring with raises or time (e.g., course release)
- Communicate recognition in small ways (e.g., email praising an achievement) and large ways (e.g., in the department newsletter, award nomination)
### Table S2

**Individual and Structural Bias in Evaluation Processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Core Content</strong></th>
<th><strong>Key Strategies: Generated by workshop participants</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Analysis of individual and structural biases</td>
<td>● Educate department faculty and external reviewers about subfield bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Examples of ways in which schemas, service loads, teaching evaluations, and faculty support affect the careers of BIPOC faculty</td>
<td>● Evaluate scholars using norms of their subfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● How to identify and mitigate subfield bias</td>
<td>● Broaden notions of scholarly impact to include impact on policy, communities, and practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Bias in teaching evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Classroom challenges and strategies faculty use to mitigate them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interactive Elements: Two scenarios and small group discussion</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subfield Bias Scenario</strong></td>
<td><strong>Addressing Subfield Bias</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael is the only faculty member of color in your department. He researches health interventions in underserved communities and he does a lot of “engaged scholarship”. He has been actively applying for NIH funding but has not yet been successful. It’s really exciting work, though, and he has published a few articles in some newer journals. At a meeting of the department’s executive committee, several faculty voiced their concerns about the journals he publishes in, and shared that they had individually counseled him to find some projects that might fit into the “flagship” journal in your field. You have your yearly meeting with Michael next week.</td>
<td>• Educate department faculty and external reviewers about subfield bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Prompts: 1) What is typical advice a chair might give? 2) Are there additional structural actions (e.g., related to policies, practices, norms, or reward systems) you could take to support the careers of faculty like Michael?</td>
<td>• Evaluate scholars using norms of their subfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Bias Scenario</strong></td>
<td>• Broaden notions of scholarly impact to include impact on policy, communities, and practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your department is reviewing the casebook of Jessica, a woman of color. Her research record and service are solid but concerns have been voiced about her teaching record. Jessica developed a new course on inequity within the field, and she alone has the expertise to teach it. She notes in her teaching statement that she worked hard in 2020 to connect her course content to current events (e.g., COVID-19 and Black Lives Matter). However, her quantitative teaching evaluations are just</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure that faculty evaluators are aware of bias in teaching evaluations prior to reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use peer-evaluation instead of or in addition to student evaluations of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide space for instructors to document their invisible teaching labor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OK: there are both very positive and very negative numeric ratings. You plan to review the student comments to get a better sense of her effectiveness in the classroom.

*Discussion Prompts:* 1) How can you make sure that tomorrow’s faculty meeting discussion of her casebook is equitable? 2) What are some structural changes that might be implemented to support faculty who are teaching in challenging environments?
Table S3

**Service Inequity and Invisible Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● National and university level data on faculty service inequities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Connections between service and leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Invisible service for BIPOC faculty including special requests, care work, and cultural taxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Approaches to increasing service equity using Six Strategies (O’Meara et al., 2021)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interactive Elements: Case study and small group discussions**

**#1: Embodied case study followed by discussion questions**

This case study depicted a newly tenured Associate Professor, Robin, sharing a subset of her experiences of service at the university and the particular challenges they have caused for her. It used a mix of conversational disclosure and spoken word performance that was developed for this workshop by the U-M Center for Research on Teaching and Learning (CRLT) Players.

*Discussion Prompts:* 1) What factors seem to be influencing how Robin feels about and responds to the service requests made of her? 2) What are the interpersonal pressures that are creating challenges for Robin in navigating service requests?

**#2: Implementation of service equity strategies (see Key Strategies)**

*Discussion Prompts:* 1) What are challenges that might arise in the implementation of the six strategies? 2) What are some ways to overcome these challenges?

**Six Key Strategies: From Faculty Workload and Rewards Project (O’Meara et al., 2021)**

- **Transparency:** Information about service engagement is easily accessible and widely visible
- **Clarity:** Establish clear expectations about service
- **Credit:** Recognize and reward service, including invisible service
- **Norms:** Collectively commit to fair distribution of service
- **Context:** Recognize that faculty have different strengths, interests and demands, include service as part of faculty leadership development
- **Accountability:** Establish mechanisms to ensure that faculty members fulfill their work obligations and receive credit
### Table S4

**Cultivating a Climate for Faculty Equity**

**Core Content**
- Five dimensions of climate -- historical legacy, compositional diversity, organizational climate, behavioral climate, and psychological climate -- adapted from work by Hurtado et al. (1998)
- National and university level data on the climate for BIPOC faculty (e.g., tokenism, incivility, surveillance)
- Framework for shifting climate: Eight Levers Practice in applying eight levers to climate challenges (U-M ADVANCE RISE Committee, 2020)

**Interactive Elements: Three scenarios and discussion (small and whole group)**

*Prompt for all scenarios: What are options for responding, using the eight levers?*

**Sample Scenarios (see [https://advance.umich.edu/rise/](https://advance.umich.edu/rise/) for additional examples)**

**Scenario #1:** How can you foster respect and inclusion in your unit when there has been a racially-motivated threat or incident on campus directed at the BIPOC community?

**Scenario #2:** At a recent faculty meeting, you allocated time to brainstorm strategies around increasing the diversity of the faculty. After several ideas were vocalized, one faculty member says, “But we have to ensure we are also maintaining excellence in our faculty.” The enthusiasm in the room noticeably diminishes at that point and the discussion ends.

### Key Strategies to Improve Climate Using Eight Levers:

- **Environment:** the physical workspace and virtual workspace
- **Expectations:** Words, actions, and cues that define how group members will contribute to group goals
- **Interactions:** Relational dynamics that emerge when people are working together
- **Language:** Communication used by a community to negotiate shared meaning and build group coherence and understanding around ideas, behaviors, and actions
- **Modeling:** Displaying oneself as an example to imitate for expected and acceptable behavior
- **Opportunities:** Conditions or circumstances that make it possible to do or achieve something
- **Routines and Structures:** Informal practices as well as formalized policies and procedures that constitute a group’s way of doing things.
- **Time:** Use and expectations around time that reflect the organization’s values
Table S5

Panel Discussion on Preemptive Retention

Core Areas of Discussion

- Creating an environment of inclusion
- Preemptive retention
- Making counter-offers to strong outside offers

Key Strategies: Offered by panelists

Creating an Environment of Inclusion

- Work to improve unit climate
- Change narratives of diversity as being in conflict with excellence
- Engage in best practices around faculty hiring
- Recognize different pathways to professor and up the career ladder
- Increase transparency and clarity around norms and expectations
- Be an ambassador for the research of BIPOC faculty in your department

Preemptive Retention

- Have continuous conversations with faculty so you can learn about and help them achieve their goals
- Create an environment in which faculty members want to stay
- Recognize faculty contributions
- Create structures for service equity
- Incorporate broad indicators of research impact in evaluation processes

Making Counter-Offers to Strong Outside Offers

- Use outside offers to understand the aspects of the job that are desirable but potentially missing at their current institution
- Find ways to meet important needs reflected in the outside offer (e.g., connect the faculty member to networks or resources)