The February 2018 revelation that at least 18 Harvard students, staff, and faculty members had reported incidents of sexual harassment by Professor Jorge Dominguez—dating back decades—triggered a crisis within our community. We believe the University and the Government Department failed to uphold a basic commitment: the provision of a safe and productive work environment. That failure directly affected dozens of students, staff, and junior faculty. The allegations reported by the *Chronicle of Higher Education*—and the difficult weeks that followed—brought considerable pain, anxiety, and insecurity to members of our community.

The Dominguez crisis laid bare an alarming chasm in the department. While most faculty members were unaware of reports of ongoing misconduct, such knowledge had long been an “open secret” among many students, staff, and a few junior faculty members. More broadly, student participants in the March 2018 town hall meetings made it clear that incidents of inappropriate behavior, as well as perceptions of unfairness, lack of inclusion, and excessive hierarchy, remained widespread—a point that was powerfully reinforced by public letters signed by 105 graduate students and 205 undergraduate students.

The crisis demanded a response. For nearly everyone in our community, it was clear that the department urgently needed to foster trust, open up channels of communication, and create a safer and more inclusive workplace.

In their March 2018 letter, undergraduate students challenged faculty members to initiate a “deep departmental reform” aimed at ensuring that “the next generation of Harvard students, staff, personnel, and junior faculty will feel and, more importantly, be safe in our department.” If the department failed to act, the graduate student letter warned, it would not only “fail to protect individuals from harm” but also “threaten to deter promising young scholars from contributing their talent and energy to the discipline.”

Crises create openings for change. This one presents us with an opportunity to rethink existing norms and practices, develop and debate new ideas for improving our climate, and ultimately, create a better department. The Government Department should be at the frontier of academic efforts to combat harassment and promote equality. We aspire to be a model of how to build an inclusive community that enables all of its members to pursue academic and teaching excellence.

***

2 Undergraduate letter to the Government Department faculty, March 7, 2018.
3 Graduate student open letter to the Government Department faculty, March 6, 2018.
In March 2018, Government Department Chair Jennifer Hochschild created the Committee on Climate Change (CCC). Chaired by Steven Levitsky, the CCC was composed of 15 regular members: six ladder faculty, one non-ladder faculty, two staff, three graduate students, and three undergraduates. 4 The department chair, Director of Graduate Studies, and Director of Undergraduate Studies would serve as ex officio members:

Danielle Allen (faculty)
Fernando Bizzarro (graduate student)
Melani Cammett (faculty)
Nara Dillon (DUS, ex- officio, beginning January 2019)
Ryan Enos (DGS, ex officio\(^5\))
Sarah Fellman (undergraduate)
Jennifer Hochschild (department chair, ex officio)
Torben Iversen (faculty)
Leslie Finger (non-ladder faculty)
Katrina Forrester (faculty)
Jeffry Frieden (faculty)
Sarah James (graduate student)
Kaneesha Johnson (graduate student)
Karen Kaletka (staff)
Steven Levitsky (faculty, committee chair)
Danielle Roybal (undergraduate)
Claire Sukumar (undergraduate)
Adip Vora (undergraduate)
Thom Wall (staff)
Cheryl Welch (DUS, ex officio through December 2018)

The CCC was given a mandate to work through the 2018-2019 academic year, with the objective of producing a report and recommendations for departmental consideration by Spring 2019.

The CCC was a community-wide effort. In addition to the 20 CCC members listed above, numerous other members of the Government community worked on one or more of the CCC’s subcommittees or provided advice and feedback over the course of the year. In particular, we thank Matthew Blackwell, Jessie Bullock, Julia Coyoli, Reva Dhingra, Meredith Dost, Frances Hagopian, Sophie Hill, Casey Kearney, Shiro Kuriwaki, Manuel Meléndez Sanchez, Allison Myren, Pia Raffler, Jon Rogowski, Shannon Parker, Susan Pharr, Zuneera Shah, Theda Skocpol, Dustin Tingley, Aaron Watanabe, and Olivia Woldemikael for their contributions.

Julia Coyoli, David Romney, and Aaron Watanabe not only provided outstanding research assistance but also contributed to the development of the CCC’s final recommendations.

\(^4\) Because one undergraduate CCC member took a leave of absence in Fall 2018, an additional undergraduate was appointed; consequently, there were four undergraduate members in Spring 2019.

\(^5\) Ryan was originally a regular CCC member but became oficio when he succeeded Dustin Tingley as DGS in July 2018. He will retain his previous subcommittee responsibilities.
This report offers recommendations for new policies, practices, and institutions that, in our view, should help create a safer, less hierarchical, more inclusive, and thus more productive climate within the Government Department. We are under no illusion that these initiatives, by themselves, will generate the fundamental changes to which many of us aspire. They are initial steps—steps that we must monitor, evaluate, revise, and build upon in the months and years to come.

Formal institutions, by themselves, do not produce social or cultural change. Real change requires community engagement and active compliance with those institutions. Therefore, we are encouraged that so many members of the Government community—faculty, staff, undergraduates, and above all, dozens of graduate students—engaged in the “climate change” process. Over the last 14 months, CGIS has been the site of an extraordinary number of conversations, debates, and arguments—sometimes quite heated—about how to create a safer, more inclusive, and more intellectually engaging climate. Ultimately, it is these conversations (and arguments) that will change the culture of the department.

***

Initial Agenda and Subcommittees

The CCC met twice in Spring 2018 to develop an agenda and a work plan for the year ahead. Taking the March 2018 graduate and undergraduate student letters as a starting point, we developed a seven-point agenda and designated a subcommittee to pursue each item.

1. **External Review.** The CCC should explore the feasibility of an external review of Harvard’s collective failure to respond to problems of alleged sexual harassment. Such a review would examine why mechanisms of oversight broke down and how department/university culture and institutional practices may have permitted harassment to take place and inhibited communication about instances of harassment.

2. **Departmental Response to Harassment.** There is broad agreement that the department could do more to prevent misconduct and facilitate reporting when misconduct occurs. Thus, the CCC should explore steps that the department can take to improve information dissemination, advising, and reporting around issues of harassment in all forms, including, but not limited, to sexual harassment. It should consider alternative reporting mechanisms, such as anonymous online reporting mechanisms, peer-based reporting, and the creation of a harassment officer. It should also explore alternative forms of harassment training.

3. **Recruitment and Retention.** Research has found that the most effective means of combating harassment and discrimination in organizations is to hire and promote more women and minorities. The CCC should thus evaluate strategies to improve the department’s efforts to meet Harvard’s goal of “recruit[ing] from the broadest possible pool of exceptional talent.” It should also examine the department’s poor record of retaining female faculty and develop recommendations for combating this problem.

---
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4. **Inclusive Climate.** The CCC should develop recommendations aimed at enhancing the department’s ability to “support the flourishing of all members of the community, regardless of background.” This includes gathering information on the current climate in the department, as well as exploring steps such as strengthening the graduate Diversity Working Group’s student climate survey, creation of a standing committee on diversity, diversity training, use of symbols and spaces, and issues of ideological diversity.

5. **Departmental Democratization.** Students, faculty, and staff perceive our department to be more hierarchical than many peer departments. The CCC should explore mechanisms to change that. Potential agenda items include evaluating the culture and practices in graduate workshops; considering ways to enhance graduate student participation in departmental governance; considering steps to increase social interaction in the department; and re-evaluating the department’s use of physical space.

6. **Mentoring.** The CCC should explore ways in which our junior faculty, graduate, and undergraduate mentoring systems could be improved and made more inclusive. The subcommittee will examine practices in other Harvard departments and at peer institutions, such as peer mentoring, “pastoral” advising, and a Michigan-style G1 and G2 “check-in” system.

7. **Teaching and Training.** The CCC should consider how instruction and curricula can be revised to improve the department’s climate. Potential topics include the department’s supply of courses and advising on issues of race and gender in politics, as well as problems if ideological diversity and discrimination.

The subcommittees worked throughout the 2018-2019 academic year, often recruiting additional faculty and student members from outside the CCC. The subcommittees launched several initiatives that are already up and running. They also developed a set of recommendations to the department, which the full committee discussed and approved in Spring 2019.

The following sections summarize the subcommittees’ activities and recommendations.

---
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1. External Review Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Steve Levitsky (co-chair), Jennifer Hochschild (co-chair), Danielle Allen, Fernando Bizzarro, Melani Cammett, Ryan Enos

Summary of Work: In spring and summer of 2018, Steve and Jennifer held a series of consultative meetings with colleagues outside the department, including Iris Bohnet (HKS), Frank Dobbin (Sociology), David Ellwood (HKS), Robin Ely (HBS), Mala Htun (alum, University of New Mexico), Elizabeth Lunbeck (History of Science), Gina Sapiro (Boston University and Chair of APSA Ethics Committee), and Lewis (Harry) Spence (Professor of the Practice, GSE). Following these meetings, the Subcommittee shifted its focus from a departmental-level review to an FAS- or university-wide review. In October, after consulting with more than a dozen faculty members, Steve, Melani, and Ryan drew up a letter calling on the administration to sponsor an external review of the University’s institutional performance in the Domínguez case. The memo was discussed in the October 23 Government Department faculty meeting and endorsed (via consensus, without a vote) by the faculty. At the same time, 124 graduate students sent a letter to the administration making a similar request. On October 30, Jennifer, Melani, Ryan, and Steve met with Peggy Newell (Deputy Provost), Claudine Gay (Dean of FAS), Nina Zipser (Dean for Faculty Affairs and Planning), Nina Collins (Associate Dean of FAS), Eileen Finan (Office of General Counsel), and Paul Andrew, Anna Cowenhoven, and Melodie Jackson of Harvard Public Affairs and Communication (HPAC) to discuss the department’s request. Administration officials agreed in principle to an external review, although the specific nature of the review will not be determined until the Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR) investigation until the Domínguez case is completed.

Initiatives

1. Call for External Review. In April 2019, the CCC voted unanimously to send a statement of strong support for an external review to the University administration. On May 1, the committee sent the following statement to President Lawrence Bacow, Provost Alan Garber, Deputy Provost Peggy Newell, FAS Dean Claudine Gay, Dean of Social Science Lawrence Bobo, Dean for Faculty Affairs and Planning Nina Zipser, and Eileen Finan (Office of General Counsel):

The Committee on Climate Change (CCC) in the Government Department requests that the University initiate an external review of Harvard’s response to alleged misconduct by Professor Jorge Domínguez. In so doing, it reiterates a call made in October 2018 by the Government Department faculty and in a letter signed by 124 Government graduate students.

The scandal triggered by the February 2018 Chronicle of Higher Education article revealed an alarming gap between most of the administration and faculty, on the one hand, and many students, staff, and junior faculty, on the other, with respect to our awareness of, and concern about, Domínguez’s behavior. Alleged instances of harassment and other unacceptable behavior had been “open secrets” in the department since the mid-1990s. Generations of students warned one another about Domínguez’s behavior and developed coping strategies for interactions with him (e.g., wearing heavy clothing, avoiding late afternoon meetings). Some students changed the focus of their research—at great cost—in order to avoid such interactions.

This deplorable situation went on for more than 20 years. There appear to have been a few instances in which individuals reported unacceptable behavior to various actors in the university, yet we are
not aware that any action was taken. Professor Domínguez received three major appointments during this period: Director of the Center for International Affairs (1996), Chair of the Harvard Academy (2004), and Vice Provost for International Affairs (2006). For many current and former students, faculty, and staff, these promotions—together with inaction despite the seemingly widespread knowledge of his behavior—created the impression that the university knew about this behavior but did not care. To this day, we know little about what caused this prolonged institutional failure.

The Committee therefore asks the administration to invite a credible outside expert (or experts) to evaluate how departmental, FAS, and university-wide procedures, practices, and norms may have contributed to our collective failure to provide a safe and productive work environment for all members of our community. Such a review should explore three central questions:

1. What characteristics of our organization or culture might have inhibited those who had suffered (or were aware of) misconduct from reporting it?
2. When misconduct was reported, what inhibited an effective response?
3. How did Professor Domínguez’s WCFIA, Harvard Academy, and Vice Provost appointments go through without uncovering any reports or allegations of misconduct?

We seek a comprehensive review of our institutions and collective practices, rather than an investigation into possible misconduct or negligence on the part of any individual members of the Harvard community. It is essential that the review be forward-looking, or focused on drawing lessons from the past in order to strengthen our institutions at all levels for the future. The goal is to improve the Harvard community and position Harvard as a leader in academia in fostering an inclusive and supportive environment for all.

We believe the following are necessary for a review to be successful and credible:

- The review should be led by individuals from outside Harvard who have independent reputations.
- The scope of the review should not be limited to the Government Department; it should also consider how FAS- and University-level policies and practices contributed to failures of communication and reporting.
- The final report should be made public, although steps could be taken to ensure the anonymity of individuals.

The Committee believes an external review is critical for at least three reasons. First, when the Government Department created the Committee on Climate Change in March 2018, partly in response to public letters from graduate and undergraduate students, it committed itself to taking steps to reduce the likelihood of harassment, improve our capacity to respond to instances of harassment, and build a more inclusive and less hierarchical community. To develop effective reforms, we need a solid understanding of what went wrong in the past. An external review, together with regular departmental climate surveys, would help to provide such an understanding.

Second, the Domínguez scandal undermined trust in the department and the university. Simply committing ourselves to doing better in the future is insufficient to restore that trust. Harvard must send credible signals that it is serious about building a more inclusive and constructive environment.

Third, the Government Department must improve its recruitment and retention of women and minorities, especially on the faculty. Our ability to attract the best faculty and students will be
impaired if Harvard is viewed as unable or unwilling to respond effectively to the Dominguez scandal.

If we, as a university, allowed harassment to occur (and recur) as alleged, then we failed to uphold a basic commitment to our community: the provision of a safe and productive work environment. Hundreds of students, staff, and junior faculty felt the consequences of this failure. We must analyze what went wrong, both to ensure that we do not repeat these mistakes and to establish Harvard as a leader in the pursuit of workplace equity and inclusion.

***
2. Departmental Response to Harassment Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Steve Levitsky (chair), Meredith Dost, Sarah Fellman, Torben Iversen, Karen Kaletka, Allison Myren, Pia Raffler, Aaron Watanabe.

Summary of Work: The subcommittee was tasked with developing proposals aimed at reducing to a minimum instances of harassment and other inappropriate behavior, as well as lowering the barriers to reporting misconduct. Between September 2018 and March 2019, the subcommittee took the following steps aimed at developing recommendations that are consistent with scholarly research, best practices in other departments and universities, and existing University rules and policies:

- Invited Frank Dobbin of the Sociology Department to present his research on the effects of harassment training
- Met with Susan Pharr, who served as the Government Department’s Sexual Harassment Officer for several years during the 1980s and 1990s, and Frances Hagopian, who served as Ombudsperson for the Center for International Affairs (CFIA) in the late 1980s, to elicit their feedback and suggestions.
- Talked to colleagues at UC Berkeley, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, MIT, Notre Dame, Penn, Princeton, Stanford, and Yale about their departments’ harassment policies.
- Allison Myren and Aaron Watanabe explored a range of online reporting systems and presented each system’s advantages, pitfalls, and costs to the Subcommittee.
- Steve Levitsky held three meetings with Harvard Title IX Officer Nicole Merhill to explore options for in-person harassment training, discuss what the department can/cannot do in terms of anonymous reporting mechanisms, and ensure that our proposed Title IX Liaison position (below) is compatible with University rules, procedures, and policies.
- Sent draft proposals to Nicole Merhill of the Title IX Office and Eileen Finan of the Office of General Counsel and gained their approval.

Recommendations

1. Creation of a Departmental Title IX Liaison Position. The events of 2018 highlighted the need to lower the barriers to reporting misconduct in the department. Toward that end, we propose a department create a Title IX Liaison\(^8\) tasked with working to promote a safe and inclusive community for all students, staff, and faculty.\(^9\) The appointee will be a senior faculty member, named by the chair in consultation with faculty, staff, and students, and serving a two or three-year term. The Title IX Liaison will serve as a neutral point of contact for students, staff, and faculty within the department, supporting individuals in response to concerns regarding misconduct, discrimination, and general incivility.

---

\(^8\) The position’s title is preliminary.

\(^9\) The department established a sexual harassment officer position in the 1980s. Susan Pharr served in this position into the 1990s.
Although the precise implementation of the liaison’s duties will be left to the department and the chair, we make the following recommendations:

1. **Training.** The appointee should attend annual comprehensive training provided by the Title IX Office. This training covers:
   - Mechanisms available through the Title IX Office, the Office for Dispute Resolution, and the Harvard University Police Department (HUPD) for responding to allegations of sexual harassment (e.g., formal complaints, informal resolutions, interim measures, and criminal complaint processes);
   - Private, confidential, and confidential/privileged resources available both on and off campus;
   - The Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment Policy and Procedures for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; and
   - Strategies to interrupt and intervene when problematic behavior occurs (i.e., bystander intervention training).

The appointee should also be encouraged to participate in monthly training provided by the University’s Title IX Office.

2. **Title IX Connection.** The appointee should serve as the Government Department’s liaison to local Title IX coordinators, the University Title IX Office, and other relevant campus resources. This will require developing a good understanding of Title IX procedures and a close working relationship with Title IX personnel.

3. **Information Dissemination.** The liaison’s should disseminate information about Title IX procedures, as well as the various campus resources available to community members with concerns about harassment, discrimination, or other unacceptable behavior or practices. Activities in this area might include annual orientation meetings, as well as the voluntary training and information sessions discussed below.

4. **Consultation** The liaison should serve as an accessible point of contact to whom students, staff, and faculty may turn for information and advice regarding behavior or practices that affect their ability to pursue excellence in teaching and learning regardless of background. For matters involving the FAS Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment Policy, the liaison will connect students, staff, or faculty with local Title IX Coordinators. For those who do not wish to be connected to a Title IX coordinator, the appointee may play an intermediary role, serving as a conduit of information from, and channeling questions to, the Title IX office. In areas beyond sexual and gender-based harassment, the appointee will assist students, staff, and faculty in identifying and accessing support services and/or available departmental and university-wide mechanisms to address concerns raised.

5. **Evaluation.** The department should undertake an evaluation of the liaison position after three years in order to identify problems and potential steps to improve it.

---

10 As a responsible employee, the liaison will be obligated to report all relevant disclosures to the Title IX Office.
2. Harassment Training. The March 2018 graduate and undergraduate public letters requested that the department provide “annual, in-person harassment training” for all members of the department. Since then, the University Title IX Office has established mandatory online training for all members of the Harvard community. The CCC examined existing research on the effects of harassment training and invited Frank Dobbin to present his work in this area.11 Dobbin and others have found no evidence that mandatory harassment training reduces harassment (and some evidence that it is counter-productive). However, they found evidence that bystander intervention training can be effective in curbing harassment.

We therefore recommend that the Title IX Liaison work with the University Title IX Office to organize, at the beginning of each year, an in-person bystander intervention training program for the department. Participation in these sessions would be voluntary but should be encouraged by the department chair. Ideally, all members of the Government Department community will participate in this programming at least once.

3. Mechanisms for Anonymous Reporting. To further reduce barriers to reporting, we planned to propose the adoption of an online anonymous reporting system, to be overseen by the faculty Liaison. However, the Title IX Office will launch a university-wide anonymous reporting system in July 2019 and thus asked us to refrain from creating an alternative system. We agreed, and recommend instead that the Title IX Liaison work with the Title IX Office to establish procedures to coordinate with the new system. For example, anonymous reporters should be able to choose whether or not their report is passed on to the liaison. When permission is granted, procedures should exist to ensure that the liaison promptly receives the report.

4. A Town Meeting to Assess Progress. Toward the end of the 2019-20 academic year, the department should hold a town hall-style meeting with the chair, the liaison, and a representative from the Title IX Office to discuss the effectiveness of the department’s new harassment policies. The meeting would be an opportunity for members of the Government community to ask questions and offer feedback about departmental, FAS, and university-wide harassment policies and procedures.

---

3. Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Torben Iversen (chair), Melani Cammett, Sophie Hill, Kaneesha Johnson, Jon Rogowski, Danielle Roybal, Thom Wall.

Summary of Work: The recruitment and retention of women and minorities, especially at the junior level, is a crucial component in cultivating a tolerant and welcoming environment where sexual harassment is rare. Frank Dobbin presented evidence to the CCC showing that a more equal gender balance and racial-ethnic diversity greatly diminish the incidence of sexual and racial harassment. A comprehensive 2012 review of the literature reaches the same conclusion\(^\text{12}\) and highlights the severe negative consequences of sexual harassment on the victims. A new Swedish study\(^\text{13}\) finds a strong positive relationship between the share of men in an occupation and sexual harassment. Based on such evidence, recruiting and retaining female faculty must be a central pillar in any sustained strategy to prevent or reduce future instances of sexual harassment. A similar argument applies to racial and ethnic diversity.

Here we briefly describe the methods and deliberation behind the subcommittee’s recommendations.

Recruitment Procedures

Comparison to Peers. To provide a solid empirical basis for our discussions, we collected a variety of data that compare the Government Department to 11 peer institutions (see Appendix A). The numbers show that the share of women in the Government Department roughly matches the average across our peers: about 30 percent. The share of minorities is a bit lower than the mean, but the numbers here are very small and therefore sensitive. Where the Government Department is clearly lagging is in the number of women at the tenure-track, junior level: we currently have only two. We made offers to two women in 2018-19: one accepted and another declined. If both had accepted, we would have been at the mean of our peers.

Hiring Record. We also examined our recent hiring record. Over the past five years, and across ranks, we have recruited five men and four women. To gauge whether we might have failed to hire obvious female candidates at the junior level we compared our actual hires to women who were interviewed but not hired. We used several indicators of scholarly productivity and impact: number of books, peer reviewed articles, citations, and major awards and recognitions. Nothing in this comparison suggests that the department made bad hires or missed out on exceptionally talented women or minority candidates. The data were shared with Jennifer Hochschild and Tim Colton (the department chairs under which this hiring took place) and they concur.


We then tried to cast the net wider and examined the hiring decisions of our peer departments over the past eight years to see if we might have missed any strong female or minority candidates in the fields where we had open positions. This exercise shows that exceptionally talented women, measured by the same indicators as above, were indeed appointed by our peer institutions (other than Harvard PhDs). This is particularly true in IR and American. The potential candidates (i.e., women hired elsewhere) were all several years out from their PhDs, which suggests that that they may have been “targeted” hires and therefore not necessarily in the pool of candidates for our searches. Whatever the reason, we are reasonably sure they did not apply to Harvard. Yet, it is noteworthy that we also hired candidates who had been out for several years, but in most cases compared them only to newly-minted PhDs. This is a potential problem.

**Outreach.** It is impossible to second-guess the hiring committees and what information they had available at the time, but the numerous junior hires of exceptionally talented women at our peer institutions highlight the critical importance of outreach. If we recruit only among new PhDs, the task of ensuring a large, diverse pool is manageable: we need to advertise broadly, emphasizing our interest in diversity, and use our professional networks to make sure that all eligible candidates do apply. But if we also want to consider candidates who are already in tenure-track positions elsewhere, the hurdle is higher. To ensure the best overall pool of candidates, potential candidates will have to be identified and contacted individually, which is a labor-intensive process.

The most recent hiring committee (chaired by Daniel Ziblatt) carried out an exceptionally thorough outreach to identify potential candidates. It is notable that it did not simply rely on advertising the job but actively sought to identify potential candidates and encourage them to apply. The procedures followed by the Ziblatt committee are summarized in Appendix B. It represents an exemplary effort to be followed by future hiring committees. Still, if we want to consider not only newly-minted PhDs but also candidates who are several years out, we need a more thorough outreach procedure for potential candidates who are junior faculty elsewhere.

The committee also encourages efforts to reach out to women and minority candidates at APSA, especially in years when we are hiring. The Women’s Caucus for Political Science, for example, meets during APSA and we should advertise open positions at Harvard in that forum and make clear that we share their concerns about gender equality in the discipline.

**Selection.** Concerning the selection process itself, a main potential issue is implicit bias. In her presentation to the CCC, Iris Bohnet at the Kennedy School documented such bias in great depth and recommended the use of an evaluation form designed to reduce such bias after a “long” shortlist of finalists has been agreed on (in advance of a selection committee meeting).

A second source of implicit bias is when the overall applicant pool is reduced to a long shortlist. Prior knowledge about certain candidates from our professional networks, or low expectations about candidates with certain traits, can easily lead to the exclusion of strong prospects. The Harris School addresses this problem by anonymizing the first round of reading files.14

**Hiring in Gender, Race, and Ethnicity Studies.** Finally, the committee discussed the absence of any appointments in the fields of race, gender and ethnicity since Claudine Gay came to the
department in 2008 (and Gay is serving as Dean of FAS and no longer teaching). Thom Wall met with our undergraduate program staff to get a sense of the type of courses that are in high demand by Harvard College students, yet largely missing from our offerings. Race, immigration, identity, and gender politics were among those most frequently mentioned, and these are also areas where most candidates for positions are women or minority.

The CCC Teaching and Training sub-committee shared its data on courses taught on race, gender & ethnicity at Harvard and at five of our peer universities over the last five years; (see Appendix D for a summary table). The department is roughly in line with Berkeley, Columbia, Princeton, and Stanford in terms of number of courses offered, but we fall far behind Yale which offers more than twice as many courses (6.2 on average compared to 2.8). In terms of tenured and tenure-track faculty we are in the middle of the pack (three faculty), but since Claudine Gay is a dean and not teaching for the foreseeable future, we de facto only have two faculty.

It is perhaps an indication of the high demand for courses in these areas that we, like most of our peer institutions, often turn to visitors and lecturers to offer courses. There is much turnover in these fields as a result, which is not desirable from the perspectives of developing an intellectual community or effective student mentorship. We are simply not keeping up with demand in terms of regular faculty.

From the perspective of recruiting women and minorities, hiring in these fields is likely to be highly effective. Of the 19 faculty who have offered courses in these areas 17 are women or minorities.

Retention

In the past 25 years, only two women went up for tenure, with one being promoted (Lisa Martin). By contrast, we find that 14 men went up for tenure and 12 were promoted. Many others accepted outside offers. We have an obvious problem of retaining junior women in the department long enough for them to be considered for tenure, even controlling for the smaller number of women.

With the help of Jennifer Hochschild and Tim Colton, we examined every case of female faculty who left during their tenures as chairs for common denominators. While each case was unique, some possible factors that may contribute to the low retention rate include:

1. **Spousal Careers.** Several women have left the department as a result of moving with their spouses. The problem is exacerbated by the university policy of not making “spousal appointments” for the purpose of retaining faculty. The university does in some instances make non-tenure offers to spouses (postdocs and lecturers), but this may not be enough. There is probably not much we can do about this; it is mainly a problem at the university level, while the department usually has an interest in making this work out.

2. **Long Time to Tenure.** Because of Harvard’s system where tenure comes with promotion to full professor, tenure decisions typically occur two years later than in most of our peer departments. For women who want to start a family after getting tenure this may be a reason

---

15 Aaron Watanabe collected the data and Nara Dillon helped organize it.
to accept tenure offers elsewhere, before they have a chance to be considered at Harvard. We do not know if that has been a factor in the past.

3. **Low Expectations of Tenure.** Until roughly two decades ago, the Government Department rarely tenured faculty from within. That low expectation of tenure seems to have lingered among women faculty, although there is again no hard evidence on this. The simple fact that virtually no women go up for tenure may perpetuate the perception that it is virtually impossible – a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy.

4. **Parental Leave.** Melani is on the University committee charged with reforming Harvard’s parental leave policy. It will likely become more generous, but this is not likely to greatly improve the chances of women getting tenure. Assuming that the policy is applied equally to men, since men tend to spend less time on caregiving they may use parental leave get even farther ahead. At any rate, the policy is not for the department to set.

5. **Risk Aversion.** Much evidence in economics and finance suggests that women are on average more risk-averse than men. That might of course not apply to political science faculty, but experience is not inconsistent with the idea that women tend to see outside offers as a reason to leave (“a bird in the hand”), whereas men tend to see them as confirmation that they have a good chance of tenure at Harvard. Again, this is speculative.

The committee agreed on the importance of mentorship to alleviate some or all of these issues. Even though all incoming junior faculty are assigned an advisor, more support may be needed for especially women and minority faculty. Mentors need not be women or minority; Frank Dobbin finds that both men and women tasked with promoting the careers of specific individuals make it a matter of personal and professional pride to help them succeed. They not only help their mentees navigate the department and the discipline, but also lean against excessive risk-aversion and underestimated probabilities of tenure.

**Recommendations**

1. **Faculty Hires in Gender, Race, and Ethnicity Studies.** The department is urged to ask the deans for authorization to conduct one search in the field of gender politics and one search in the field of race and ethnicity. These searches would likely help to recruit women and minorities. Of the 19 faculty (tenured and tenure track) who have offered courses in these areas at Harvard and five of our peer institutions (Berkeley, Columbia, Princeton, Stanford and Yale), 17 are women or minorities or both. Furthermore, these faculty would help to broaden our course offerings on race, immigration, identity, and gender politics, which are in high demand yet largely missing from our offerings.

2. **Creation of New PhDs Database.** In order to systemize the process of identifying promising candidates and encouraging them to apply for junior faculty positions, the department is urged to create a database of all new PhDs from our peer institutions (broadly defined) recording the gender, minority status, subfield, and employment status of each. It will be updated annually, and candidates will remain in the database until they are four years past graduation. All junior hiring committees will consult this database in addition to already-established outreach procedures. The
work will be done by a data officer and adequate resources will be set aside for the purpose. This proposal results from finding that exceptionally talented women accepted offers from peer institutions but the department did not consider when making hires in their field at Harvard. The likely reason is that they did not apply and had not been identified by our usual outreach efforts. The database will help make sure we do not miss promising candidates who might be persuaded to apply. Keeping track is particularly important because we often hire candidates who are 2-4 years out.

3. **Tools for Minimizing Implicit Bias.** Hiring committees for entry-level positions are urged to adopt tools to minimize implicit bias. There are multiple ways to accomplish this and each hiring committee should use the most appropriate method for their search. In many circumstances the use of two tools will be appropriate:

1. **Anonymized Abstracts.** Using anonymized abstracts of job market papers for the first reading. The most promising projects/candidates will be retained for the next round. Then all applications will be read in their entirety to make sure no strong candidates were missed in the first round. The anonymized first-round reading helps to put the focus on the candidates’ ideas without regard for their institution, advisor, etc., and insulates the evaluation process from intellectual biases. We recommend it be in addition to the current first-round reading. We should never eliminate anyone until all files have been read; the purpose of the first anonymous round is to identify promising candidates who may otherwise fall through the cracks.

2. **Evaluation Form.** In moving from a “long short list” to the finalists we encourage committees to use an evaluation form. A version of such a form (adapted from one used by the Kennedy School) is included in Appendix C. The aim is to make explicit the criteria each committee member uses in his or her assessment.

With respect to campus visit, the committee reiterates the importance of creating a welcoming atmosphere and ensuring that all candidates receive an equal chance to present their work without too many interruptions.

4. **Junior Faculty Mentorship.** The department should take measures to strengthen the mentorship of new faculty. To that end, we propose that newly hired faculty, their assigned mentor, and the chair meet (i) at the start of a junior appointment to agree upon expectations regarding the scope of the mentor’s responsibilities; and (ii) at the end of each academic year to make sure these expectations are met and set goals for the coming year. The meetings are intended to formalize the mentoring role and to signal its importance. The goal is to improve retention and advancement of junior faculty, especially women and minorities. Much evidence\(^\text{16}\) shows that mentorship from senior faculty can significantly improve productivity and advance professional careers. The main role of the mentor is to provide instrumental advising on career development, professional networking, publication strategies, and scholarship; yet, the role is broadly understood to include

\(^{16}\) Presentation by Frank Dobbin to the CCC. See also

all issues that affect the welfare of the junior faculty. The importance of the mentoring role may be conveyed by highlighting the common procedure of appointing a senior faculty to promotion committees who is deeply knowledgeable of a candidate’s work (this need not be the mentor, although in practice it often is).
4. Inclusive Climate Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Ryan Enos (chair), Melani Cammett, Sarah Fellman, Katrina Forrester, Sarah James, Karen Kaletka, Danielle Roybal

Summary of Work: The subcommittee worked on three areas during the 2018-19 academic year: implementing a department-wide climate survey, creating two events to foster an inclusive community, and expanding training for teaching fellows.

Initiatives

1. Climate Survey. With the assistance of the Office of Institutional Research, the subcommittee fielded a departmental survey on climate to all members of the Department in February 2018. The survey team consisted of Ryan Enos (Professor and subcommittee chair), Matthew Blackwell (Associate Professor and consultative member), Katrina Forrester (Assistant Professor and committee member), Sarah James (PhD Candidate and committee member), Karen Kaletka (Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies and committee member), Shiro Kuriwaki (PhD Candidate and consultative member), Danielle Roybal (undergraduate committee member), and Zuneera Shah (undergraduate consultative member).

The climate survey was completed by a very healthy 74% of the department, including 91% of graduate students and 86% of faculty.

Following the release of the survey report, listening sessions were held with both undergraduate and graduate students.

The subcommittee’s full report on the survey can be found here: https://gov.harvard.edu/files/gov/files/govclimatesurveyfinalreport.pdf

The report’s Executive Summary is included as Appendix E.

2. Inclusive Programming. The subcommittee designed and launched two new events with the explicit goal of creating an inclusive environment.

   1. **Fall Welcome Event.** An expanded welcome back event, held in the Fall, in the form of a barbecue that includes all members of the department (including undergraduates) and features family-friendly lawn games. We recommend that this event be continued moving forward.

   2. **The Sidney Verba Lecture Series.** This is a cross-field series designed to create a common intellectual space. The event will be held once a semester, with a talk followed by a reception. All faculty, students, and staff will be encouraged to attend. The Verba Lecture Series was successfully launched in 2018-19. The first speaker was Molly Roberts of UCSD, followed by Rafaela Dancygier of Princeton. Both talks were widely attended and greeted with enthusiasm. The department has requested funding to carry the series forward, twice a year.
3. Expanded Teaching Fellow Training. For undergraduate students, the classroom is the primary point of contact with the department and a good deal of their instruction comes from graduate student teaching fellows (TFs). Inclusion, therefore, entails quality instruction with special attention to inclusive pedagogy to a diverse student body. As such, we built and instituted expanded TF training in the 2018-19 academic year. This mandatory training for G3s will be expanded once again in the 2019-20 academic year. As part of this new programming, we significantly expanded the training around inclusive pedagogy.

Given the climate survey’s findings regarding the discomfort felt by many conservative students (30 percent of self-identified conservatives reported not feeling comfortable voicing their opinion in a classroom setting, while nearly 50 percent reported that they do not feel they can be their “authentic self” in the department), future TF training should include sensitivity to ideological diversity.

Recommendations

1. Biennial Climate Survey. We recommend that a department-wide climate survey be repeated every two years. The survey should be conducted in the spring so that sophomore undergraduate concentrators will be included and so that G1s and new hires will have spent a semester in at Harvard and in the department before taking the survey. Such a survey will allow us to identify areas of improvement and areas of need in department climate and, therefore, to understand whether our efforts are having the intended effect. The chair should appoint a committee consisting of faculty, students, and staff to complete the survey and issue a report. These committees should be able to use the template of previous surveys, therefore making the task less onerous.
5. Departmental Democratization

Subcommittee Members: Jeff Frieden (chair), Fernando Bizzarro, Ryan Enos, Casey Kearney, Pia Raffler, Thom Wall, Reva Dhingra

Summary of Work: The subcommittee was established because of the perception that the department was excessively hierarchical. This was seen as at least part of the reason that information about sexual misconduct was not brought to the attention of the senior faculty. More generally, many in the Government Department community felt that there was not enough interaction among members of the community, and that the interaction that existed was insufficiently inclusive. The subcommittee focused on several areas that had been mentioned by faculty and students as potentially needing attention and improvement.

Initiatives

1. Research Workshops. Concern had been expressed about the climate in some of the workshops. We wrote two memos on appropriate management of and behavior in the research workshops: one for those involved in running the workshops (See Appendix F), one a guide for students (See Appendix G). We held a meeting on September 4 to which all those running workshops were explicitly invited, along with anyone else interested. At that meeting the memos were distributed; they have also been sent to the entire faculty and graduate student body. We have since re-sent them to workshop coordinators.

Feedback so far has been relatively positive. Reports from the workshops indicate that the Memo and Guide received attention. Going forward, we must continue to monitor and evaluate whether concerns raised have been fully addressed.

The remaining issue has to do with faculty involvement in workshops, which apparently varies substantially from sub-field to sub-field (i.e. in some workshops only those getting course credit attend, while in others most of the faculty in the sub-field attend). This raises issues related to the three plus one topic currently under discussion, and is a departmental matter. It has been brought to the chair’s attention and, we are assured, will be discussed in conjunction with the broader issue of faculty responsibilities and credit.

2. Spatial Relations. We discussed the possibility of a reallocation of under-utilized space, and the acquisition of material to encourage use of common spaces (i.e. coffee machines for 2nd and 4th floors). There was agreement that the graduate student lounge needs to be upgraded, and that the fourth floor lounge space could be improved. These issues are now being considered by the Graduate Policy Committee.

Recommendations

1. Graduate Student Inclusion in Departmental Committees. Graduate students have expressed an interest in being included in departmental committees. This is a fairly common practice among our peer departments, and we recommend that the department adopt it. We sought and received clarification from FAS as to which committees were off limits: these are those committees
(typically for hiring and promotion) that look at confidential material, such as evaluation letters from faculty elsewhere. As for the remaining committees, we solicited and received the view of the Graduate Student Association (GSA) on this matter. The GSA suggested that volunteers be solicited for the relevant/available committees, and that the chair then choose among the volunteers. The issue was taken up at a faculty meeting on April 23, at which it was decided to follow this general pattern. The chair will inform the GSA, and all graduate students, of available committees; graduate students will volunteer for committees as they wish, informing the GSA of their interest; the GSA will forward the full list of volunteers to the chair, who will ordinarily select committee members from the list in consultation with committee chairs and student advisers. The specific list of relevant/available committees remains to be determined.

2. **Town Hall Meetings.** Students raised concerns about the paucity of information from the department about goings-on in the department. They suggested more regular communications from the department leadership. We therefore recommend the continuation of the department-wide town hall meetings initiated in 2018-19. These gatherings should be limited to once per semester, unless there is a greater need. This may help create an environment in which more voices can be heard.

It is important to schedule and announce town hall meetings well in advance, to signal that we take them seriously and to ensure the widest possible participation. It would also be desirable to have an agenda, or at least potential themes for discussion, in order to help encourage attendance. This could include advance submission of topics, and the possibility to leave anonymous comments in some format before the meeting, which would make it easier for people to get sensitive issues and discussion points on the agenda. It may also be useful to keep a speakers’ list, so that individuals could "reserve" a spot to speak. We may also want to collect anonymous comment notes at the end of the event.

It might make sense for town hall meetings to be scheduled during the Tuesday 3-5 PM slot, which is now designated for departmental business. This would allow us to avoid other potential conflicts.

3. **Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion.** As the Committee on Climate Change prepared to conclude, some students, faculty, and staff expressed concern that the CCC’s conclusion will result in an institutional void on efforts to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion. We therefore propose the creation of a standing Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) committee composed of departmental faculty, staff, and students. The committee will:

1. Monitor progress on CCC initiatives.
2. Assist in the development and implementation of recruitment and retention strategies for underrepresented students, faculty, and staff.
3. Coordinate and disseminate information on university and external resources for students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented backgrounds. Underrepresented groups include, but are not limited to, religious, race/ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, national origin, age, and disabled minorities.

---

17 The Chair may consider students’ standing within the graduate program in deciding among volunteers for committee service. Subfield and G-year may also be taken into consideration.
We suggest that the chair constitute a task force, composed of faculty, staff, and students, to design the committee’s mission statement and organization. The task force should present its plan no later than in the Spring of 2020.

The EDI committee would chiefly serve to promote and monitor initiatives spearheaded by the CCC, as well as respond to identified gaps in departmental efforts on equity, diversity, and inclusion. The committee would complement existing efforts by graduate students, such as the Graduate Student Association Diversity Committee. It would ensure that issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion that affect not only current members of our community but efforts at recruitment are addressed by a cross-cutting group of students, faculty, and staff.

Committees such as this have become a common institutional tool in many organizations. For example, twenty-five percent of a comprehensive sample of large research departments in five comparable research institutions (Brown, Columbia, MIT, Stanford, and Yale) have standing committees with missions and scopes similar to the one we propose.

4. Graduate Classroom to Table Program. During 2018-19, the subcommittee recommended that the department establish a program to allow groups of graduate students to take a faculty member to lunch or dinner, as a way of encouraging more informal interaction between graduate students and faculty. The College sponsors a program, called “Classroom to Table,” that allows up to five undergraduates to invite a faculty member to lunch or dinner at one of several area restaurants (with which they have arranged the administrative aspects). Once set up, the students and faculty member simply arrive, eat, and leave. This has turned out to be, we think, a very valuable way to foster interaction between undergraduate students and faculty. A similar model would be very useful for graduate student-faculty interaction.

The department requested and received GSAS funding for a pilot Classroom to Table program in 2018-19. It has worked well: nine student-faculty meals were held in Spring 2019 and two more have been scheduled. Feedback from students has been uniformly positive. We recommend that the Department seek funding to continue this program.
6. Mentoring Subcommittee

Subcommittee Members: Danielle Allen (chair), Fernando Bizzarro, Nara Dillon, Katrina Forrester, Jeff Frieden, Kaneesha Johnson, Claire Sukumar, Thom Wall.

Summary of Work: The subcommittee held five full meetings between May 2018 and April 2019, as well as a full day retreat in January 2019. Our initial charge was to explore ways in which our mentoring system could be expanded and improved.

From May 2018 through Jan 2019, we pursued a “discovery” phase, in which we (1) worked internally to document the life-cycle of graduate and undergraduate students in our department and the points at which mentoring is relevant to them, (2) reviewed the climate survey instrument to ensure that its questions would facilitate understanding the situation with mentoring in the department; (3) reviewed the data that came in from that survey; and (4) engaged with research shared with us by the University of Wisconsin’s Center for Improved Mentoring Experiences in Research (CIMER).

In Spring 2018, we began to develop documentation for the “life-cycle” of graduate students with a view to ascertaining where improvements in mentoring would be most needed. We also explored research on best practices in mentoring. We sought and received funding to bring a team of researchers from CIMER to guide us through the research on mentoring and help us think about improvements. The CIMER-led mentoring retreat, held on January 16, 2019, was attended by 50 students, staff, and faculty from across GSAS.

The mentoring retreat gave us several key concepts that facilitated our further work. These included the notion that “mentoring” is actually a bundle of different activities including academic advising, supervising (as in lab work or RA-ships), mentoring (listening and helping the student think for themselves about professional decisions), and sponsorship (helping a student network and find opportunities). These different elements of mentoring need not all be carried out by the same person, and students need to understand that they have the job of creating a “mentoring mosaic,” so that all of these functions are covered by somebody. The retreat also helped us focus on how important aligned expectations are between mentor and mentee. Many programs use mentoring contracts, as we do for undergraduate theses, and this is something we may wish to consider once we have addressed the low-hanging fruit items that we recommend focusing on now. We were also given good examples of effective trainings that have produced measurable improvements in the quality of faculty mentoring.

PDFs of the readings and presenter slides for the retreat can be found here: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ajHio2Od9RQRkMlp0iYTd34T_SiYFCJ3?usp=sharing

After the morning component of the retreat, where we dug into the material presented by CIMER, the smaller Government Department team assembled to address mentoring in our own department. We revised our “life-cycle” document making use of the new concepts we had acquired that morning, and were able to prioritize the issues that we identified as requiring attention.
We then used our spring semester committee meetings to refine the recommendations that we wished to put on the table for the full Climate Change Committee. This report recommends low-hanging fruit items. That said, we would also urge that the Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Policy Committee could carry forward the conversations about the potential use of mentorship contracts and mentor training.

Our recommendations are motivated by the following observations of our graduate and undergraduate students’ experiences in the department and with mentoring.

**Graduate Students**

Our program suffers from insufficient provision of information to students, a lack of clarity about expectations at key points in the program from general exams to prospectus through dissertation writing, and a common lack of alignment between faculty and student understandings of responsibilities around mentoring. While we think there is significant room for improvement in our mentoring--across all the dimensions of academic advising, supervision (as in an RAship), career support, and support for self-efficacy and independence--we also think our program has important “low-hanging fruit” opportunities that should be addressed first. While we may well want to build in training for mentors, whether as part of an orientation for newly arriving faculty, or at other key career points, we came to the conclusion that the first and most important step was to establish a solid foundation for the alignment of expectations between graduate students and faculty mentors.

**Undergraduate Students**

Over the last decade the undergraduate student population has grown increasingly diverse, along numerous dimensions, bringing a range of background and prior educational experiences to the college and a diversity of expectations around career development. A successful program of mentoring must evolve to meet these varying needs.

The subcommittee identified three top priority issues for improving undergraduate experience in the department and ensuring that we are providing pathways of engagement that could support a diverse cohort of concentrators:

1. Students enter Government courses with a wide-range of prior experiences with writing instruction; non-alignment between previous instruction and Government Department expectations can thwart success.

2. Students generally report an experience of disconnection from faculty.

3. Students who do not complete a thesis generally have fewer opportunities to receive mentoring. Relatedly, only a small number of our concentrators go on to careers in academia, and many concentrators perceive that the department provides little career mentoring to those whose aspirations lie outside of the academy. The differential experiences of mentoring that result from being oriented or not oriented to graduate school intersect with issues of diversity, insofar as students with less prior exposure to the
academy are typically less immediately likely to consider graduate school a possibility. Successfully mentoring all of our students requires building pathways into the thesis for those for whom it’s not an obvious choice and also providing high quality mentoring for those who do not choose a thesis or who are not oriented toward graduate school as a possible future.

**Recommendations: Graduate Mentoring**

1. **Life Cycle Spreadsheet.** We recommend that the department finalize and make the “life-cycle” spreadsheet a regular tool for use by the Office of Graduate Studies.

2. **Mentoring Guidelines.** We recommend that the department create one-pager guidelines for advisors, committee members, and graduate students on important topics, such as:

   1. Advising First & Second Year Graduate Students
   2. General Exams
   3. First Time Teaching/ Working with a First Time TF
   4. Pre-Prospectus Meeting
   5. Process for Forming a Committee
   6. Prospectus Defense
   7. Dissertation Year Funding
   8. Dissertation Defense
   9. Building Your Mentoring Mosaic

3. **Third Year Advisor.** Currently, when students enter the program, they are assigned an advisor to provide academic advising around course selection. This advisor’s duties de facto cease after a student has completed coursework. Students often struggle to find appropriate advising to help them make the transition from coursework to the development of the prospectus. To that end, we recommend that before end of second year, students must ask a faculty member to serve as their third-year advisor and submit a signed “third-year advisor form” to the graduate program administrator. This faculty member has the responsibility for guiding a student through the pre-prospectus meeting and the process for forming a committee. It is not necessary for the third-year advisor to become the chair of (or even serve on) the dissertation committee, although that may frequently occur. The third-year advisor will hand-off to the dissertation committee chair, once the committee is formed and finalized.

**Recommendations: Undergraduate Mentoring**

1. **Expansion of GovWrites.** We propose that for the next stage of this work, the department seek funding to support the extension of GovWrites, a writing instruction module currently used in Gov 20, throughout the department’s introductory courses (Gov 10-50, 97, and 1060) to address out students’ differential writing preparation: In addition, the leaders of the GovWrites program are interested in exploring the possible creation of a GovCommunicates program that might depend on student leadership to develop community building programs around public expression and debate. We recommend that introductory course faculty be tapped as a resource for exploring and potentially implementing this idea.
2. Faculty Thesis Advising. All three of our recommendations seek to reconnect faculty to the undergraduate program, but we think it is important to prioritize rebuilding the connection of faculty to senior thesis advising in particular. Fewer than half of our approximately 50 thesis writers are currently advised by faculty members. We propose the following:

- All faculty should be listed on the department website as potential thesis advisors.
- The department should encourage faculty members to advise at least one undergraduate thesis a year. This should be the norm.
- Adopt an experimental program in which a faculty member could work with a graduate student as paired advisors to a thesis writer. This is a model used in other departments and serves both to give graduate students training in how to advise theses and faculty members support in keeping track of the logistics of thesis advising. We propose to develop this model on a voluntary basis, as a form of experimentation with new models of thesis advising aimed at strengthening faculty participation in the process.

3. Expanded Support for Non-Academic Careers. We propose that the department build into its annual calendar of events, and into the life-cycle plan for Government concentrators, more activities aimed at exposing students to professional careers in fields related to political science. Specifically, we propose that the department hold an early fall semester internship fair to expose students to summer internships in politics, policy, media, non-profit, and think-tank internships that build on the skills acquired in a Government concentration. These efforts would require collaboration with the Office of Career Services, Dudley House, Phillips Brooks House, the Center for Public Interest Careers, and the Institute of Politics at the Kennedy School. In addition, we recommend that a small faculty advisory committee be established to support this effort.

For all three of these recommendations, we propose that the Director of Undergraduate Studies be responsible for reporting back to the Curriculum Committee and the department in Spring 2020 on the state of progress on these initiatives.

4. Additional Staff Support. In support of these recommendations to expand our undergraduate advising, and in support of recommendations for improving the undergraduate experience from the Teaching and Training Subcommittee, we recommend that the department seek the addition of a .5 FTE to the department’s Office of Undergraduate Studies.
7. Diversity in Teaching and Training

Subcommittee Members: Nara Dillon (Chair); Cheryl Welch (Chair); Danielle Allen, Jessie Bullock, Leslie Finger, Sarah James, Dustin Tingley, Adip Vora.

Summary of Work: The subcommittee identified three goals for improving the climate of the Government Department’s classes and training programs:

1. To make the curriculum more responsive to student interest in issues of gender, race, and ethnicity.
2. To foster the free exchange of ideas in an atmosphere of mutual respect in our classes.
3. To provide training for women preparing to do fieldwork in places where they are likely to face sexism, sexual harassment, or risks to their personal safety.

Gender, Race, and Ethnicity in the Curriculum

To understand how responsive our curriculum is at present, the sub-committee compared our course offerings on race, ethnicity, and gender over the last five-years to five of our peer universities with their course catalogs accessible online (see Appendix D). This comparison highlighted the gap in our course offerings that developed after the departure of some junior faculty and Claudine Gay’s promotion to the administration. After a year’s gap, these holes in the curriculum have been filled by a series of non-ladder lecturers and college fellows. Even with these short-term solutions, Harvard lags behind many of our peer universities in this area of the curriculum. The subcommittee therefore supported the proposal to hire more faculty who specialize in race, gender, and ethnic politics to provide a long-term solution to this shortfall.

In the meantime, the subcommittee helped to establish a working group among the faculty who teach the foundation courses in the undergraduate curriculum: Gov 10, 20, 30, 40 and 97. These faculty have begun to meet each semester to discuss how to make these introductory courses more relevant to our students’ interests. In addition, they have shared ideas about whether and how to mainstream issues such as gender into our core curriculum. The subcommittee secured a grant from the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) to hire RAs to help update the syllabi of the introductory political theory and IR courses (Gov 10 and Gov 40) this semester. This effort builds on an earlier OUE grant to renew the sophomore tutorial. All three courses added new case studies designed to help students apply the theories used in class to contemporary political issues. In addition, readings by women and underrepresented minorities were added to the Gov 40 syllabus. This working group plans to continue meeting next year to assess the reforms adopted so far and to discuss whether to extend them to the other foundation courses as well.

Free Exchange of Ideas

To understand the climate and the exchange of ideas in our classrooms, the Teaching and Training Subcommittee sponsored a series of undergraduate focus groups. The focus group sessions highlighted the central role that TFs play in our curriculum. They also called for more attention to including marginalized students in class discussion and for promoting more debate among students. The October 2018 climate survey provided more evidence that supported these initial
findings, highlighting that women, under-represented minorities, LGBTQ+, international students, and political conservatives all reported lower levels of belonging in our community. This was especially true of conservatives, nearly 50 percent of whom reported they do not feel they can be their “authentic self” in the department.

To respond to these concerns, our subcommittee focused on improving TF training. Last fall, the requirements for the TF training course Gov 3002 increased, including a new mandatory session on promoting an equitable and inclusive classroom environment. Staff from the Bok Center ran this session, but both our Gov 3002 instructors and several graduate students found that the focus on self-reflection and the undergraduate perspective offered limited strategies for maintaining an open dialogue while managing the controversial issues that often arise in a government classroom. Next fall, our instructors will design and teach this mandatory session themselves, seeking to develop an approach more suitable for classes about politics. In addition to the focus on gender, race, ethnicity, and sexuality found in many equity and inclusion training programs, the new training session will put special emphasis on fostering ideological diversity as a critical aspect of our pedagogy. Once we have developed a training program that is judged to be effective, we will offer these resources to any faculty who are interested in improving the climate in their own classes.

Fieldwork Training

Over the years, female graduate students have accumulated knowledge about “what to do” in to stay safe in the field, ways to prove their competence, or prevent sexual advances from interview respondents or other professional colleagues. Most of this knowledge is learned and relearned by each graduate student, or at best passed down by word of mouth. The subcommittee considered how to institutionalize this knowledge and communicate it to students to help them have safe and productive experiences while conducting fieldwork.

Initiatives

1. Fieldwork Training Workshop. To provide training for students who plan to do fieldwork, our subcommittee received a grant from the Government Department to hold two student-led training workshops in April 2019. Jessie Bullock and Julia Coyoli developed a training program that built on an MIT workshop on fieldwork in conflict zones held last year. Bullock and Coyoli organized two departmental events aimed at providing systematized training for our students regarding fieldwork: one for graduate students and another one for undergraduate thesis writers. While a portion of the events was geared towards addressing gender related concerns in the field, the events were targeted to both male and female students.

The graduate student workshop featured a faculty panel discussion led by women comparativists who have done fieldwork around the world, including Liz Perry, Melani Cammett, Pia Raffler and Viridiana Rios. In addition, the workshop also included a session on preparing safety plans and break-out sessions led by faculty and advanced graduate students who have done fieldwork in the same region of the world. These smaller group discussions delved into the context-specific issues of sexism, sexual harassment, and safety. Fifteen graduate students attended the workshop,
including both men and women. The same group of advanced graduate students led the undergraduate workshop for students who plan to do fieldwork as part of their senior thesis research. The undergraduate version included both the general session on safety plans and regional break-out sessions for smaller group discussions. Fifteen undergraduates participated in this workshop from a wide range of concentrations, although the majority were Government and Social Studies concentrators.

The student-led model worked well for this topic, providing the perspective of people who have recently done fieldwork (or who are currently doing it—Jessie Bullock led one session by Skype from Brazil). Furthermore, it made the smaller group discussions about so many different regions of the world possible (including Latin America, the Middle East, Africa, South Asia, East Asia, and Europe).

**Recommendations**

1. **Fieldwork Training Workshops.** We recommend that the department continue to support the fieldwork training workshops developed and piloted by Jessie Bullock and Julia Coyoli in 2018-2019. This may require a small amount of funding. The DGS and DUS should work to institutionalize the workshops as annual training activities. Toward this end, we recommend that the department hire a graduate student fieldwork coordinator each year to organize the fieldwork workshops.
Summary of CCC Initiatives Undertaken During the 2018-2019 Academic Year

1. **Call for External Review.** In May 2018, the CCC sent a letter to University administration calling for an external review into University, FAS, and departmental-level institutional failures in the Domínguez case.

2. **Climate Survey.** In October 2018, the Inclusive Climate Subcommittee with support from the University conducted a department-wide climate survey.

3. **Inclusive Programming.** The Inclusive Climate Subcommittee helped launch two new events with the explicit goal of creating an inclusive environment: 1) Fall welcome back event and 2) Sidney Verba Lecture Series.

4. **Expanded Teaching Fellow Training.** In Fall 2018, the requirements for the mandatory TF training course Gov 3002 increased, including a new mandatory session on promoting an equitable and inclusive classroom environment.

5. **Research Workshops.** Concern had been expressed about the climate in some of the workshops. The Departmental Democratization Subcommittee wrote two memos on appropriate management of and behavior in the research workshops: one for those involved in running the workshops (See Appendix F), one a guide for students (See Appendix G).

6. **Graduate Classroom to Table Program.** The College sponsors a program, called “Classroom to Table,” that allows up to five undergraduates to invite a faculty member to lunch or dinner at one of several area restaurants. Once set up, the students and faculty member simply arrive, eat, and leave. The CCC requested and received GSAS funding to create for a similar program for Government graduate students and faculty. The program was piloted in Spring 2019: 11 student-faculty meals were organized.

7. **Mentoring Retreat.** In January 2019, the Mentoring Subcommittee held a day-long mentoring retreat led by expert’s from the University of Wisconsin’s CIMER.

8. **Responsive Curriculum Discussions.** The CCC Teaching and Training Subcommittee helped to establish a working group among the faculty who teach the foundation courses in the undergraduate curriculum: Gov 10, 20, 30, 40 and 97. These faculty have begun to meet each semester to discuss how to make these introductory courses more relevant to our students’ interests. In addition, they have shared ideas about whether and how to mainstream issues such as gender into our core curriculum.

9. **Fieldwork Training Workshops.** In April 2018, the Teaching and Training Subcommittee organized fieldwork training workshops led by experienced graduate students.
Summary of Recommendations

1. Creation of a Departmental Title IX Liaison Position. We propose a departmental Title IX Liaison, tasked with working to promote a safe and inclusive community for all students, staff, and faculty. The appointee will be a senior faculty member, named by the chair in consultation with faculty, staff, and students, and serving a two or three-year term. The liaison will serve as a neutral point of contact for students, staff, and faculty within the department, supporting individuals in response to concerns regarding misconduct, discrimination, and general incivility.

2. Harassment Training. We recommend that the departmental liaison work with the University Title IX Office to organize, at the beginning of each year, an in-person bystander intervention training program for the department. Participation in these sessions would be voluntary but should be encouraged by the department chair.

3. Harassment Policy Town Hall. Toward the end of the 2019-20 academic year, the Department should hold an open town hall-style meeting with the chair, the faculty liaison, and a representative from the Title IX Office to discuss the effectiveness of the department’s new harassment policies.

4. Gender, Race, and Ethnicity Searches. The department should seek authorization to conduct two junior faculty searches: one in the field of gender politics and one in the field of race and ethnicity.

5. Recent PhD Database. The department should create a database of all new PhDs from our peer institutions recording the gender, minority status, subfield, and employment status of each. It will be updated annually, and candidates will remain in the database until they are four years past their Ph.D. All junior hiring committees will consult this database in addition to already-established outreach procedures.

6. Minimizing Implicit Bias in Hiring. The CCC recommends that hiring committees for entry-level positions should be encouraged to adopt tools to minimize implicit bias. There are multiple ways to accomplish this and each hiring committee should use the most appropriate method for their search. In many circumstances the use of two tools will be appropriate:

   1. Anonymized Abstracts. Using anonymized abstracts of job market papers for the first reading. The most promising projects/candidates will be retained for the next round. Then all applications will be read in their entirety to make sure no strong candidates were missed in the first round. The anonymized first-round reading is in addition to the current first-round reading.

   2. Evaluation Form. In moving from a “long short list” to the finalists we encourage committees to use an evaluation form.

7. New Faculty Mentorship. To strengthen mentorship for new faculty, we propose that: (i) at the start of a junior appointment there will be a joint meeting between the newly hired faculty, the mentor, and the chair where expectations are agreed upon; (ii) at the end of each academic year
there will be another joint meeting to make sure these expectations are met and set goals for the next year.

8. **Biennial Climate Survey.** We recommend that a department-wide climate survey be repeated every two years. The survey should be conducted in the spring so that sophomore undergraduate concentrators will be included and so that G1s and new hires will have spent a semester in at Harvard and in the department before taking the survey. The value in such a survey is that it will allow us to identify areas of improvement and areas of need in department climate and, therefore, to understand whether our efforts are having the intended effect. The department chair should appoint a committee consisting of faculty, students, and staff to complete the survey and issue a report.

9. **Graduate Students on Departmental Committees.** We recommend that the department include graduate students on departmental committees where permitted by FAS (approved in April 23 faculty meeting).

10. **Regular Town Hall Meetings.** Students raised concerns about the paucity of information from the department about goings-on in the department. They suggested more regular communications from the department leadership. We understand that these are being arranged. In addition, we recommend the continuation of department-wide town hall meetings initiated in 2018-19. These gatherings should be limited to once per semester, unless there is a greater need.

11. **Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee.** We propose the creation of a standing Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee composed of departmental faculty, staff, and students. The committee will:

   1. Monitor progress on CCC initiatives.
   2. Assist in the development and implementation of recruitment and retention strategies for underrepresented students, faculty, and staff.
   3. Coordinate and disseminate information on university and external resources for students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented backgrounds.

   We suggest that the chair constitute a task force, composed of faculty, staff, and students, to design the committee’s mission statement and organization. The task force should present its plan no later than in Spring 2020.

12. **Life Cycle Spreadsheet.** The CCC recommends the creation of a “life-cycle” spreadsheet to be a regular tool for use by the Office of Graduate Studies.

13. **Graduate Advising Resources.** We recommend that the writing of “one-pager” guidelines on a range of topics for graduate students and advisors.

14. **G3 Advisor:** We recommend that before end of second year, graduate students must ask a faculty member to serve as their third-year advisor and submit a signed “third-year advisor form” to the graduate program administrator. This faculty member has the responsibility for guiding a student through the pre-prospectus meeting and the process for forming a committee.
15. Expansion of GovWrites: We propose that the department seek funding to support the extension of GovWrites, a writing instruction module currently used in Gov 20, throughout the introductory curriculum. In addition, the leaders of the GovWrites program are interested in exploring the possible creation of a GovCommunicates program to develop community building programs around public expression and debate.

16. Faculty Thesis Advising: In order to rebuild the connection of faculty to senior thesis advising, we propose the following:
   - All faculty should be listed on the department website as potential thesis advisors
   - The department should encourage faculty members to advise at least one undergraduate thesis a year.
   - Adopt an experimental (and voluntary) program in which a faculty member could work with a graduate student as paired advisors to a thesis writer.

17. Non-Academic Career Planning: We propose that the department build into its annual calendar of events, and into the life-cycle plan for concentrators, more activities aimed at exposing students to professional careers in fields related to Government. Specifically, we propose that the department hold an early fall semester internship fair to expose students to summer internships in politics, policy, media, non-profit, and think-tank internships that build on the skills acquired in a Government concentration.

18. Additional Undergraduate Staff: To make structural improvements to undergraduate advising and teaching, we recommend that the department seek the addition of a .5 FTE to the department’s Office of Undergraduate Studies.

19. Fieldwork Training Workshops: We recommend that the department continue to support the fieldwork training workshops piloted in 2018-2019. This may require a small amount of funding. The DGS and DUS should work to institutionalize the workshops as annual training activities. Toward this end, we recommend that the department hire a graduate student fieldwork coordinator each year to organize the fieldwork workshop.
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Data on Composition of Faculty

% Faculty who are Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% Faculty who are Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average without Harvard</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Faculty who are Minority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% Faculty who are Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average without Harvard</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Female and Male Faculty

% Non-Tenured Faculty (including lecturers) who are Female

% Non-Tenured Faculty (excluding lecturers) who are Female
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“Best practice” for Junior Searches

The recent open-field search chaired by Daniel Ziblatt did an exemplary effort to identify and advance a diverse pool of candidates. We quote the committee report to serve as an example for other committees to follow, and we amend it at the end.

“One of our central priorities in this open-field junior search was to generate an applicant pool that was as diverse as possible on a variety of dimensions, including gender, ethnicity, academic background, and subject of study. To that end, we took several key steps before examining the applicant list. We first circulated the “FAS Recommendations for Ensuring the Integrity of Faculty Searches,” and met with Chris Kruegler at a meeting with the committee before the start of the Fall semester to discuss priorities and strategies. Second, based on this conversation, we discussed as a committee other possible strategies to ensure as diverse a pool as possible and shared with each other our various canvassing strategies.

In response to these discussions, we did the following:

- To get a sense of the pool, we first identified ABDs/recent PhDs on the market using the lists of placement candidates available at the websites for the following departments: Yale, Princeton, Duke, Stanford, Michigan, Columbia, Berkeley, Chicago, NYU, MIT, and UCSD. We compiled the 165 candidates along with their subfield and website, if available, in a Google sheet.
- We also reviewed the current occupants of twenty-seven relevant prestigious postdoctoral fellowships.
- We put together a list of recent APSA dissertation prize winners

We then each sought to recruit as diverse a pool as possible. These included the following:

- One committee member reached out to faculty colleagues in Comparative Politics and Political Economy at University of Chicago, Berkeley, Columbia, Stanford, and Yale to alert them of the search. In her emails, she stressed that the committee especially welcomed applications from women and minorities.
- Another committee member (a specialist in international relations) reached out directly to contact IR scholars at APSA meeting in person or by e-mail including those at Princeton, Stanford, USC, Washington University, UCSD, Yale, LSE, and Columbia. These conversations included a general inquiry about promising students and a comment that it was an open subfield search with high priority on hiring women and underrepresented minorities.
- A third committee member contacted American politics scholars at Emory, Vanderbilt, Chicago, Stanford, Berkeley, UCLA, Princeton, Northwestern, Michigan, Berkeley, and WashU to inform them of the search, discuss the priorities of the search (commitment to diversity) and ask them to identify promising scholars whom we should encourage to apply and to directly encourage them to ask their students to apply. As part of this, this committee member actively and explicitly and directly encouraged underrepresented minority candidates that emerged from this canvass to apply.
• A fourth committee member personally wrote to political theory colleagues at Berkeley, Cambridge, Chicago, London, Oxford, Princeton, Stanford, and Yale also describing these priorities of the search and asking faculty to encourage students to apply.

• To provide a broader sweep, another committee member sent a letter modeled on a sample provided to us by Professor Mahzarin Banaji to faculty at UC Berkeley, Stanford, University of Pennsylvania, and Georgetown University. The aim was to get colleagues to encourage underrepresented minorities and women to apply who might not, and so the letter explicitly told faculty colleagues to encourage students to apply “who might for a variety of reasons” hold themselves back from applying.

• We consulted with our department chair who used her informal contacts across the United States to encourage colleagues to apply, emphasizing we were particularly interested in as diverse a pool as possible vis-à-vis women and underrepresented minorities.

The committee members reviewed all applications that came in. The committee met five times about the search and corresponded by email. Each committee member made an initial ranking of the top 5-10 candidates and agreed to read all these 40 applications especially closely. The committee met a third and fourth time to finalize the list. The committee gave all women applications close readings and attempted to identify minority candidates based on names, and gave all of those applications a close reading as well.

After the job talks were over, we solicited comments from PhD students and other faculty. In particular, in one innovation, we conducted an open-ended online survey of PhD students (34 participated) with a series of questions asking students to evaluate candidates based on the job talks, interactions, and research materials.”

In addition, the committee encourages efforts to reach out to women and minority candidates at APSA, especially in years when we are hiring. The Women's Caucus for Political Science, for example, meets during APSA, and we should advertise open positions at Harvard in that forum and make clear that we share their concerns about gender equality in the discipline. We need to do what we can to spread the word that Harvard cares about diversity.

The committee also recommends adding proposals 1 and 2, described above, to this “best practice” guide.
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**Candidate Evaluation Form**

*For evaluating the “long short-list” to be discussed in committee meeting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate’s Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted By:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use an “X” to indicate which of the following are true for you (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Read candidate’s CV</th>
<th>Read candidate’s scholarship</th>
<th>Read candidate’s letters of recommendation</th>
<th>Other (please explain):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please comment on the candidate’s overall strengths:

Please comment on the candidate’s research/scholarship:

Please comment on the candidate’s teaching ability:

Please comment on the candidate’s (potential) contribution to the department:

How familiar are you with the candidate’s subject area?

**Comparative Evaluation Form**

**PLEASE COMPARE THE BELOW CANDIDATES USING A 1-5 SCALE.**

1 – Excellent, 2 – Good, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Fair, 5 – Poor, X – Unable to Judge
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall strength</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Contributions to department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Courses on Race, Gender & Ethnicity at Peer Universities over Last 5 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Grad Courses</th>
<th>Cross-listed from another department</th>
<th>Faculty (tenured and tenure-track)</th>
<th>Minority/female Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton **</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This includes Claudine Gay, who is not currently teaching and may not for a long time (Mike Smith was dean for 11 years)
** Only two years of data
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Government Department Climate Survey Report: Executive Summary

In the year since revelations of alleged persistent sexual harassment by a faculty member, the Government Department has made a concerted effort to examine and reform our community’s climate. As part of these efforts, an extensive survey fielded during October 2018 shows that a majority find the department to have a satisfactory climate, be a place worth recommending, and have a positive professional environment. That said, women and, especially women graduate students, have less positive experiences than men. In other respects and with other groups, the department has also not met the standards of inclusion to which we aspire.

Sample and Method: A committee of department faculty, students, and staff designed the survey in order to measure how well the department allows all its members to thrive. The voluntary survey achieved a high response rate — 86% of 58 faculty, 92% of 166 graduate students, 59% of 244 undergraduate concentrators, and 91% of 11 staff members (355 total respondents). The Office of Institutional Research securely handled all personally identifiable information, and tabulations of the responses are publicly available.

Climate: On two general questions, members were largely satisfied with the department climate. Over 65% of all respondents reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the department, as well as feeling that they belong in the Government Department. Similarly, over 75% of respondents reported being likely to encourage a peer to join the department.

Disparities by Gender: On the other hand, 35% of women graduate students report being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, compared with 16% of graduate students who are men.

Disparities by Role: Graduate students in general face challenges: while 66% of faculty and 49% of undergraduates report that the department provides a sense of personal accomplishment most of the time, only 26% of graduate students report the same.

Harassment and Discrimination: The survey placed an emphasis on capturing the prevalence of harassment (conduct that interferes with one’s performance or creates a hostile work environment) and discrimination (unjust or prejudicial treatment). Nine individuals (3%) reported harassment, while 29 (9%) reported discrimination. About half of these individuals either considered leaving the community or considered discouraging others from joining because of their experience. Women and graduate students are among the most likely to report harassment. More cited gender as a basis of harassment or discrimination, compared to race, political views, or socio-economic status.

Sensitivity to Inclusion: Twenty-five percent of all respondents, 34% of graduate students, and 47% of women graduate students disagree or strongly disagree that their mentors, teachers, and advisers are sufficiently sensitive to issues of diversity and inclusion. Thus, the high levels of overall climate satisfaction may nevertheless be masking unaddressed misunderstanding.

Next Steps: The full survey instrument covered issues including workplace needs, teaching and mentoring, and professional goals. The survey helps inform other efforts in the Government
Department as we deliberate how to best serve the communities of our large, diverse, and excellent department.
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Memo on Research Workshops in the Harvard Government Department

Research workshops are a cornerstone of our department. The Departmental Democratization Subcommittee of the Climate Change Committee has been tasked with reviewing our workshop culture to ensure we use this important forum as effectively as possible. The purpose of this memo is to start a conversation by reflecting on our workshop norms and objectives, challenges, and possible solutions. It is based on conversations with current and former graduate students and faculty and a review of best practices in the social sciences.

The single most important objective of workshops is to improve the presented work. In addition, they are intended to facilitate the exchange of ideas, professionalize graduate students, and foster a strong and collegial intellectual community – thereby ultimately making all of us better scholars. We recognize differences in workshop norms across disciplines and subfields, both in format and style of engagement. While formats and styles differ, our guiding principles do not.

Common challenges
Based on conversations with current and former students and faculty, a number of common challenges emerge:

- Frequent interruptions. Questions are asked preemptively to show off. This disrupts the flow of the presentation and leaves less time for substantive, informed discussion in the end. It also means that only people willing to interrupt get to comment.
- Low faculty attendance; faculty leaving early, thus giving further incentive to interrupt speakers with comments to ensure faculty is still in the room.
- Gender and racial disparity in presenters and commenters in some workshops.
- Students being hesitant to present early work and research ideas.

Fortunately, there are a number of guiding norms and best practices we can draw from in order to create an inclusive culture that encourages the professional development of all our students.

Guiding principles
Since workshops are about improving the presented work, the best comments:

- Help everyone in the room better understand a critical aspect of the research and/or;
- Provide constructive feedback, which not only identifies shortcomings, but proposes ways to overcome them;
- Achieve the above without taking up more time than necessary, which relates both to the conciseness of the comment as well as its timing (if a speaker is about to talk about something, there is little point in preempting it -- it just takes up time and disrupts the flow of the presentation).

Showing off, tearing the presenter down, or getting “airtime” are never good reasons to comment.
Some workshops are more econ-style and have a “fencing” nature -- an active back and forth between the presenter and the audience. This is fine, so long as all participants are clear on the norms. However, in this context it is important to distinguish between combative and probing comments -- the goal should always be to (constructively) focus on the work, not the presenter:

Combative: use of the second person (“your results…”, “you’re assuming that…”, “you haven’t considered…”); Probing: use the third person (“those s.e.’s need two-way clustering”, “that graph could be interpreted differently”, “the model requires us to assume that…”) (Michael Clemens)

“In football the rule is that you’re allowed to go on the ball, and if that means hitting the player that's ok, but if you go for the player and don't hit the ball it's a foul.” (Andrea Matranga)

“1. Is the intention to jointly investigate the question, or to call attention to the cleverness of the questioner? 2. Do we assume that the speaker is an honest seeker, or that he's a scammer who should be exposed? Easy to ask hard questions without being cruel.” (Rajeev Ramachandran)

In a workshop, everyone’s voice counts. Graduate students in particular are encouraged to ask questions and provide feedback.

In the spirit of collegiality, everyone who presents is expected to regularly attend and provide feedback to others.

Practical solutions

To increase participation by faculty and graduate students

- To reduce the barriers to present early work and ideas, reserve and clearly label some presentation slots as shorter “Brainstorming” slots. Thus, workshops can have three different types of sessions: 1 hour 50 minutes for practice job talks, 55 minutes for regular talks, and 35 minutes for brainstorming sessions (all including Q&A).
- Discussion of workshop participation is part of the advising relationships. Faculty are encouraged to ask their advisees what their plans to present are, encourage them to present more often or identify workshop opportunities, as appropriate, and encourage regular participation in workshops.
- Faculty teaching field seminars can also stress that active participation in workshops is part of the field seminar, and lead by example.
- We may want to make prospectus presentations the norm to encourage everyone to present often and early.
- Graduate students are encouraged to invite their advisors, as well as any other faculty they would like to get feedback from, to their workshop presentation. Inviting faculty from other subfields (or departments) is fair game. Some workshop coordinators invite faculty on behalf of the presenting students.
• Many presenting students meet with faculty, post-docs and other graduate students who attended their talk right afterwards. This can be a very effective strategy for getting more in-depth feedback and building a relationship.

**To set an inclusive, constructive tone**

- Ensure time for Q&A to facilitate a deeper discussion and to allow participants hesitant to interrupt to make their comments.
- Allow the speaker to set the “ground rules” for the presentation, including on interruptions, and have the session chair ensure that these rules are respected.
- Be vigilant about more frequent interruptions or a less constructive tone towards particular presenters, including women and minorities. Intervene when observing such behavior and repeat the workshop norms as needed. It may be helpful to talk to repeat offenders privately.
- Keep a speaker list throughout the session. Speaker lists are generally first come first served, but can also be “strategic”, i.e. give preference to those who would otherwise not get a chance to speak.
- Tailor the seminar tone to the progress of the project and the year of the presenter. Chairs can set the tone by reminding everyone of the type of session (practice job talk, talk, brainstorming) and respective norms at the beginning of the workshop.
- Faculty in particular may want to encourage hesitant participants to ask questions and to recognize good questions and presentations after the workshop (ideally in private, open recognition can make others look comparatively bad).
- In particular for negative feedback, let us all think carefully about what needs to be said in public, and which parts are better reserved for private conversation.
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A Guide to Navigating Research Workshops in the Government Department

Research workshops are a cornerstone of our department. The most important objective of workshops is to improve the work presented. In addition, they facilitate the exchange of ideas, professionalize graduate students, and foster a strong and collegial intellectual community – thereby ultimately making all of us better scholars.

This short guide offers incoming graduate students a few recommendations on how to make the most of research workshops. While workshops differ in style, these recommendations apply widely. Ask your adviser, the workshop coordinators, and your peers for further input on any of the points below.

Participate regularly in workshops.
Select one or more workshops to which you go every week. It is a good way to become part of an intellectual community, learn about the work of your peers, and engage constructively with others’ research. Since everyone who presents is expected to attend regularly and provide feedback to others, it is also essential for preparing for your own presentations.

Coordinators will circulate a copy of the paper (or at a minimum an abstract) prior to the talk. Take time to formulate questions you have about the project in advance, and see if the presenter addresses these during the talk. Even if you do not ask them a question during the workshop, you can have a conversation with the presenter afterwards or just practice engaging with others’ research constructively. Graduate students are especially encouraged to ask questions and provide feedback.

Comment constructively.
Since workshops are about improving the work presented, the best comments:

- Help everyone in the room better understand a critical aspect of the research
- Provide constructive feedback, which not only identifies shortcomings, but proposes ways to overcome them;
- Achieve the above without taking up more time than necessary, which relates both to the conciseness of the comment as well as its timing (if a speaker is about to talk about something, there is little point in preempting it -- it just takes up time and disrupts the flow of the presentation).

Showing off, tearing the presenter down, or getting “air time” are never good reasons to comment.

Some workshops are more Economics-style and have a “fencing” nature -- an active back and forth between the presenter and the audience. This is fine, so long as all participants are clear on the norms. However, in this context it is important to distinguish between combative and probing comments -- the goal should always be to (constructively) focus on the work, not the presenter:
Combative: use of the second person (“your results...”, “you’re assuming that...”, “you haven’t considered...”); Probing: use the third person (“those s.e.’s need two-way clustering”, “that graph could be interpreted differently”, “the model requires us to assume that...”) (Michael Clemens)

“In football the rule is that you’re allowed to go on the ball, and if that means hitting the player that's ok, but if you go for the player and don't hit the ball it's a foul.” (Andrea Matranga)

“1. Is the intention to jointly investigate the question, or to call attention to the cleverness of the questioner? 2. Do we assume that the speaker is an honest seeker, or that he's a scammer who should be exposed? Easy to ask hard questions without being cruel.” (Rajeev Ramachandran)

Tailor your comment style to the progress of the research presented. Think about which comments should be made publicly and which may better be reserved for a one-on-one conversation after the talk.

Be aware of your implicit biases (social identity-based stereotyping and discrimination). All of us are responsible for counteracting our own biases and treating our colleagues with respect.

Most session chairs keep a speaker list for the Q&A after the talk. Signal to the session chair in order to be put on the list. In many workshops, a one-finger indicates a new point, while a two finger indicates that your (short) comment builds directly on someone else’s, and that you would like to jump the cue in order to contribute right away. It is up to the session chair whether they accept two-fingers (don’t abuse them).

**Present often and early.**
Getting feedback on your ideas and practicing explaining them concisely are invaluable. A number of different fora are available: in addition to the research workshops, many subfields have more informal graduate student-only workshops. It can also be helpful to form a small workshop group with other students interested in similar topics. Incoming graduate students have in the past formed first year-only groups for brainstorming purposes, which can be a useful way to explore early ideas.

There are typically three types of workshop sessions, and it is important to recognize the differences, as they have different purposes:

- **Brainstorming sessions** usually last for about 35 minutes per student. Here ideas at an early stage can be discussed. Sometimes a brief one or two-page memo is circulated; sometimes the scholar simply presents the research idea orally. Feedback may be centered on (but not limited to) useful literature, defining concepts, helping to narrow focus, and should be cognizant of the early stage of the research.

- **Research presentations** usually go for 55 minutes. In this venue, the work presented is expected to be somewhat more advanced than in brainstorming sessions. In some cases,
a paper may be circulated. Questions may build on the brainstorming session feedback topics as well as probe specifically on framing, methodology, theory, etc., with an aim to constructively develop the presentation and/or paper.

- Practice job talks usually last for the full length of the workshop. In these sessions, the idea is to simulate the typical audience at a job talk, and questions are therefore distinguished from research presentation questions in intensity and level of probing. This audience is likely to be less “friendly” than the usual workshop audience, and the audience would normally cut across sub-fields. The “simulation” is usually followed by an informal session for suggestions on how to improve the talk.

We encourage you to present your pre-prospectus and prospectus in a research workshop.

**Invite people from whom you would like to get feedback.**
A workshop presentation is a great opportunity to explain your research ideas to the people from whom you want to get feedback, and to give them an opportunity to deliberate about your ideas. Invite your advisors, but also faculty who are not on your committee (yet), post-docs, and other graduate students. Inviting people from different subfields or disciplines is fair game.

**Set the ground rules.**
While it is important to learn to manage a room, many workshops allow the speaker to set the “ground rules” for the presentation, within limits, including on interruptions. This will influence how much the session chair intervenes.

**Schedule follow-up meetings.**
In order to make the most of your presentation, schedule meetings with faculty, post-docs, and graduate students who attended your talk and whose additional feedback you would like to get immediately after your talk while everyone’s thoughts are still fresh. This can be a great way to get more in-depth feedback, both on substance and presentation style.

**Be involved in shaping workshop culture.**
If you have suggestions for improving a workshop you attend, please talk to the workshop coordinators. If you do not feel comfortable voicing your suggestions to the coordinators directly, talk to a faculty member, staff member or fellow student you trust, who can convey your suggestions to the workshop coordinators anonymously. It’s a team effort.