Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) statements expressing academic librarians' commitment to and value for diversity, equity, and inclusion are becoming increasingly prevalent as a requirement of applications for higher education librarian jobs. However, no known publication of an academic library-framed rubric to quantify these statements was discovered by the authors. Rooted in content analysis of published general faculty (non-librarian) DEI statement rubrics and a survey of DEI LIS experts, the data behind the first-known academic librarian DEI statement is introduced and discussed. This mixed-methods study will eventually result in an original scale to assess DEI statements.

INTRODUCTION

While discrimination towards marginalized communities has become unacceptable, systematic discrimination and bias remains an issue in academic hiring; requiring academic institutions to build organic platforms to uphold equity in recruitment. This, in turn, is an expanded platform for affirmative action. The new piece of affirmation action is the diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) statement.

Much like DEI, academia seeks to be diverse, equitable, and inclusive; however, how this is done varies greatly. This is largely due to the lack of applicable guidelines and rubrics for organizations, in the case of this study, academic libraries. In academic librarianship, DEI statements express the organization's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. This is an issue with which the profession has consistently struggled with. The American Library Association's 2017 Demographic study highlights that the majority of its members are White (86.7%) while membership from BIPOC groups are under 5% each. Research shows that implicit biases can play a role in fluid criteria that favor candidates from dominant groups, but utilizing predetermined criteria can offset the effects of bias.¹

While such DEI statements have become increasingly prevalent as a requirement of higher education librarian jobs, its application is not equitable and usually used as a tie breaker or ranking tool instead of a retention tool.² Further guidance needs to be developed from practical professionals as there are few publications with an academic library-framed rubric to quantify these statements.
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This mixed-methods study results in an original scale to assess DEI statements which provides additional value when used to guide the creation of DEI statements for recruitment and retention. The study aims to (1) enumerate analytical criteria utilized to inform evaluation processes when assessing a candidate; (2) critically examine DEI statement rubric framework in order to conceptualize and articulate DEI contributions and experiences; and (3) utilize DEI Statement rubric framework to review structures for current librarians around DEI contributions in order to inform annual reporting, tenure, and promotion reviews.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

This research is focused on the further diversification of librarianship by promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in the recruitment of academic librarians through the development of a rubric for understanding and comparing DEI statements of academic librarian job applicants. The rubric presented was developed from the results of a survey of hiring managers and interviews with DEI experts. It is based on an empirically developed data set that reflects the goals and ambitions and values of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in academic librarianship.

Notably, the DEI effort has been in place for more than two decades wherein best practices in academic faculty recruitment have included asking applicants for diversity statements. Despite this amount of time, research into how applicants describe diversity content in their DEI statements is limited. For example, prior research has noted that few applicants self-disclosed their own diversity characteristics in DEI statements submitted for faculty positions at their university.

Even though recruitment is only part of the encompassing DEI goal, it is recognized that “recruiting more minority faculty, particularly non-white faculty, into librarianship is an important part of creating a more diverse, inclusive, and equitable profession.” As Brewer, Cheshire, & Bradshaw note “rubrics can be utilized as a template for search committees to evaluate diversity statements.”

Sylvester, Sanchez-Parkinson, Yettaw, and Chavous analyzed the content of diversity statements from thirty-nine participants in assistant professor applicants from the academic year 2016-17. They developed content themes including Valuing and Understanding DEI; Personal Background and Experiences; Skill Building and Personal Growth; Teaching; Mentorship; Research and Scholarship; and Engagement and Service.

As Bombaci and Pejchar have recently noted, “Diversity statements are a common but unexamined tool for recruiting a more diverse workforce.” They stated that “advocates of diversity statements emphasize their usefulness in highlighting and rewarding DEI qualifications and in raising awareness of the need for DEI skills among faculty.” This research continues to emphasize the usefulness and importance of diversity statements for building the faculty workforce.

To develop guidelines for using DEI statements in faculty hiring procedures, Bombaci and Pjchar surveyed more than 209 diversity and inclusion professionals and experts in DEI from academic institutions from the United States. They noted that “the experts largely perceived diversity statements as a tool to elevate and reinforce DEI principles” and that “if DEI is an institutional priority, then this work should be explicitly rewarded in hiring, tenure, and promotion.”

From the results of their survey, Bombaci and Pjchar developed a framework for evaluating DEI statements which identifies six evaluation categories and 21 evaluation criteria. They developed a definition of excellence for each criteria which included the following criteria in their framework: accountability and metrics; actions committed to DEI; alignment with institutional DEI; future contributions to DEI; awareness of causes and consequences of systemic inequities; competency in DEI concepts and terms; cultural and emotional competency; DEI training and professional development; lived experience as a member of a marginalized group; reflects on own positionality, privilege, and learning edges; collaborating with diverse groups; promoting, recruiting and retaining diverse colleagues and students; incorporating DEI in research activities; inclusive teaching practices; teaching diverse students DEI service; involvement in DEI committees, organizations, initiatives, and programs; and outreach. This research is intended to continue this philosophy with a focus and emphasis on librarianship principles.

In reviewing the status of utilization of diversity statements, the authors located six published generic guide-
lines for evaluating academic faculty (not librarians). However, no rubrics found that were specifically tailored to academic librarianship.

The publication from Brown University Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity is noted to be a Guide to Diversifying Faculty Searches that seeks “useful information about a candidate’s qualifications and potential for future success.” It is a general guideline that is meant to help the recruiting committee develop requests for and evaluation of diversity statements from candidates across the university without regard to any specific department or college. As such, it is meant to govern the process of diversity statement inclusion into the hiring process and does not focus on librarianship. Examples of theoretical prompts, responses, and activities to be evaluated are provided, along with a sample evaluation template.

The publication from the University of Virginia provides an outline for evaluating candidate’s statements focused specifically on inclusion activities. It is presented as a matrix that is divided into the following categories: Mentoring Activities, Service Activities, Research and Teaching Activities, and Development Activities. Each of these categories is cross referenced with the following position types: Faculty Positions, Patient Care Positions, and Staff and Management Positions. It is presented in a four by three matrix that is meant to be applicable to all the faculty candidates of the University and is not specifically tailored to librarianship.

The rubric for evaluating Diversity and Inclusion statements from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln College of Engineering is presented in twelve rows by five columns matrix that also allows for calculating a raw score that may then be totaled for a final score that may be ranked across candidates. There are five rows under the category of indicators titled (A) Knowledge and Awareness, four rows that are under the category of (B) Experiences and Activities, and three rows that are under the category of (C) Plans. The scoring matrix ranges from (1) for Poor or Not Addressed, to (2) Fair or Addressed but Unclear, (3) Adequate of Addressed Somewhat Clearly, to (4) Exceptional or Clearly Addressed. The narrative provided in each intersection of the matrix attempts to provide language that may be used to guide the scoring.

The Rubric to Assess Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Statements developed by Emory University is meant to be applied to statements from all candidates for faculty positions across the University’s academic departments. It provides a 1 to 5 numerical scale for scoring five categories of the rubric, which are the following: Valuing and Understanding Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, Track Record in Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, Track Record in Mentoring Diverse Trainees, and Plans for Advancing Diversity and Inclusion. It was adapted from the rubric developed at University of California Berkeley, which is very similar. Both provide narrative statements to what is scored in each matrix box.

Another rubric with a 1 to 5 scoring system is the hiring rubric used by Brandeis University. It is divided into 3 scoring categories, each with a 1- to 5-point scale, which are the following: Knowledge about Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Experience Working to Advance Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Plans for Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Narrative descriptors are provided for each matrix box.

The rubrics presented in the above noted items do not appear to be derived from a broad, empirically developed or well-surveyed group of academic librarians. They appear to be largely developed from individuals and/or committees and based on their preferences, opinions, or life experiences. As such, they are not optimally designed to further the goals of diversity, equity, and inclusion within the field of librarianship. In contrast, the authors developed its “Academic Librarianship DEI Rubric” focused on the continually broadening of librarianship as a diverse, equitable, and inclusive profession.

**UNDERLYING MODEL**

The underlying model for this project is content analysis as it allows for data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings. With a history of more than 60 years of use in communication, across multiple disciplines, content analysis interprets the content through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns. Content analysis is a coding operation involving logic of conceptualization and operationalization. To avoid subjective interpretation, the three researchers involved in this study who will each review the content of the data. The researchers used inductive reasoning to identify important themes or classifications to provide descriptive and
explanatory conclusions concerning the impact of the DEI statements and the need for an accompanying rubric.

The research employs a six-part definition of content analysis and provides a definition suitable for the text and for this study:

Content analysis is a summarizing, quantitative analysis of messages that follows the standards of the scientific method (including attention to objectivity-intersubjectivity, a priori design, reliability, validity, generalizability, replicability, and hypothesis testing based on theory) and is not limited as to the types of variables that may be measured or the context in which the messages are created or presented.22

The “goal of any quantitative analysis is to produce counts of key categories and measurements of the amounts of other variables.”23 A quantitative content analysis has as its goal a numerically based summary of a chosen message set.” The underlying model of this study is seen as a quantitative content analysis meant to summarize the status and direction of variations in the content of required DEI statements in position applications for academic librarians. As such, it is an appropriate model to gird a study such as this one which seeks to examine the several models of statements focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion in job applications for academic librarian positions that are required by different universities and colleges which have not been guided by a common standard in their development.

The design of this study emphasizes the use of a convenient sample of statements made digitally available for the public. These published statements are meant to provide guidance to applicants for faculty positions only and are specifically used to provide guidance for completing the required DEI statements as part of the application. While the statements are not specifically focused on librarian or academic professional positions, the application to faculty will serve as a guide to this study’s goal, building a DEI rubric for academic libraries.

PART I: CONTENT ANALYSIS—DEI STATEMENTS

To create a sufficient and effective standard for an academic library faculty position DEI rubric, it is necessary to review and sample what approach institutions of higher education are currently taking when it comes to such statements. Project researchers randomly selected DEI rubrics conveniently found by online search. These statements will serve as a representative sample consisting of 19 universities (See Appendix A for a full list).

The process of content analysis of the statements included coding whether it is a private or public institution, but also highlight of the geographic location considering the political climate. In addition to other notable and influential factors in the development of a DEI statement for academic librarians. It should also be a point of information that there are three principal researchers navigating this study increasing the level of reliability and validity while decreasing the study’s limitations.

PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

The DEI statements of six private institutions were reviewed and an analysis of each individual statement can be found in appendix A. While the funding of private institutions is not linked to state funding, the state’s politics can indeed have an adverse effect on donors and other sources of funding and faculty. The level of difficulty in securing that funding varied depending on the institution’s history, partnerships, collaborations, endowments, reputation, and campaigns or fundraisers.

Diversity initiatives become ineffective when diversity is not defined from the start, or the definitions are restricted to race. In the evaluation of DEI statements of private institutions, there was a consistency in the need to define at the beginning of the statements. It was a surprise to the researchers, to find guiding questions and definitions were the opener. This leaves little to no room for assumptions and vagueness in what is being evaluated. There were also common areas for the evaluation including knowledge and awareness, experience working on and promoting diversity initiatives, and plans to contribute towards the advancement of diversity. Considering the plans towards advancement, there was also emphasis placed on whether the skill set that was needed was present or needed building. Another key discussion presented itself in the evaluation of the candidate’s contribu-
tions to diversity with sample criteria provided. This allowed credit for work done and demonstrated potential to further the platform in the new work environment. There were significant considerations for knowledge and understanding including teaching, research and professional service and activities. Lastly, the guidelines provided suggestions for reviewers to use the rubric to score and discuss the content of the DEI statement to holistically assess each candidate.

The researchers noted unique factors upon reviewing the DEI statements: how institutions defined DEI in the statement—some of which provided a glossary of terms to facilitate understanding; and how some organizations appeared to require each hiring committee to develop its own rubric, which can be problematic for a variety of reasons such as the lack of uniformity. The statements of private institutions made it clear that definition was key to success in the development and implementation of DEI statements and evaluations.

**PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS**

The DEI statements of thirteen public institutions were reviewed and an analysis of each individual statement can be found in appendix A. It is important to note that public institutions are often under the influence of politics due their reliance on state funding, which is their primary source of funding; not to diminish the fundraising campaigns.

Like the private institutions, there were common areas for the evaluation including knowledge and awareness, experience working on and promoting diversity initiatives, and plans to contribute towards the advancement of diversity; also, with consideration of whether the skill set that is needed was present or needed building. The statements of public institutions, like the private organizations, also made it clear that definition was key to success in the development and implementation of DEI statements and evaluations. Furthermore, there were more details placed in the list of consideration on how one has achieved and contributed in the area of diversity.

Below is a list of the areas focused on in the rubric used by the researchers of this paper:

1. Rating factors concerning diversity and systems of inequality to social issues: knowledge, analyzing social issues, applying knowledge, and cultural self-awareness.
2. Level of Evidence: lacking, some, and optimal.
3. Evaluation framework higher orders of thinking about diversity: identify, analyze/relate, apply, and craft and design.
4. Commitment area: knowledge, awareness, and application
5. Contributions to inclusive excellence: mentoring activities, service activities, research and teaching, and development activities.

There was an emphasis placed on the need to understand the fundamentals of DEI in higher education, research, teaching and mentoring, collaboration and leadership, and service engagement and/or outreach. A special highlight and emphasis were placed on value of the rubric as a helpful tool.

A notable finding with the public universities is that each campus of the University of California (UC) system has an individual approach to DEI statements and rubrics concerning hiring. This lead researchers to believe there was either no consensus on a system-wide statement or a singular method was not an overall consideration for the system. For this study, only four of the ten UC campuses were reviewed: Berkley, Davis, Los Angeles, and Santa Cruz. An employee of the UC system, who wished to remain anonymous, explained that each campus operates as its own community which explains the need for multiple statements across the system.

It should be noted that the level of detail found in the convenient sample of DEI statements for public institutions leads to the effective application of candidates’ evaluation. While the environment may be different, the need for effectiveness and efficiency is uniform.

**DESCRIPTIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS (MATRIX FACTORS)**

As Neuendorf points out, “a content analysis summarizes rather than reports all details concerning a message set.” The below noted information summarizes the results of the review of the various rubrics by matrix factors. This study fits what Neuendorf describes as a “descriptive content analysis.” “Here, we are careful to limit our conclusions to the content being studied” and “all variables analyzed are measures from within the content
The reviewed rubrics can be summarized by the following: 1) comparing the scales used to allocate points, and 2) by comparing the criteria used to designate rankings. For example, where points are summarized to a total, it is generally true that no or few points are given to a DEI statement which does not meet any of the specified criteria. Beyond this, there are several methods of allocating points to specified criteria. For example, when comparing the scales used to allocate points, Columbia University rubric uses three sets of rating criteria, for which points are allocated as 1-2, 3, 4-5, (low, medium, high) respectively. This is a popular or common method of allocating points to rating criteria and is used by seven of the sampled universities.

Alternatively, several universities use a linear scale: 1-Unsatisfactory, 2-Developing, 3-Good, and 4-Exemplary. This type of scale is used by Boise State University; University of Colorado, Denver; University of Maine at Augusta; University of Nebraska, College of Engineering; University of Nebraska-Lincoln, College of Engineering. Verbal descriptors may be used instead of point allocation to describe levels of evaluation, such as Lacking Evidence, Some Evidence, and Optimal Evidence, which is used by two of the universities. Similarly, the verbal descriptors of Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, and N/A are used by University of California, Davis. It is not clear that a scale indicating levels of quality for the DEI statement is used six of the sample universities. There are a variety of approaches to the methodology used to rank candidates across rubrics.

The availability of criteria used to designate ranking of the DEI statements varies across the rubrics. For example, four of the rubrics have highly elaborated criteria that specify levels of activities contributing to DEI statements. Four universities’ rubrics with moderately highly elaborated criteria were found during the search. However, the bulk of rubrics (nine) in the sample have moderate levels of criteria specificity. Of the sample rubrics, two universities provided very little criteria.

**IMPLEMENTATION IN UNCERTAINTY**

The use of content analysis for the evaluation of the selected 19 DEI statements allowed the researchers to code the statements in two categories: institution type (private or public) and geographical location. The analysis of material revealed that no matter the style of institution or the geographic location, the DEI statement is only as good as its implementation. This is not to be measured only against candidates meeting specified criteria, but also practices and policies. Anytime guidelines are reviewed and/or call for amendment, there is a need to assess policy in which such practices have been sheltered towards. In 2023, the practice of implementing policy is still difficult. Not only for the hard work of organizational change, but the politics involved in educational policy.

**PART II: CONTENT ANALYSIS—INTERVIEWS OF LIS PROFESSORS AND PRACTITIONERS**

The research team reached out to 20 LIS professionals and practitioners to conduct a thematic narrative analysis. Thirteen (65%) of those contacted agreed to be interviewed. Through the analysis, the team identified seven emergent themes via an inductive category development approach. All 13 interviewees identify as people of color and/or LGBTQIAAP+: Four of the 13 interviewees openly identify as LGBTQIAA+; four of the 13 are male identifying; nine of the 13 are female identifying; five of the 13 are Hispanic identifying; two are Asian identifying; five are Black identifying; and one is white identifying.

Most pertinent among the emergent themes was the actual importance of DEI statements, which questioned by most of the interviewees. Interviewees noted that these statements are ‘performative’ and that search committees do not follow up with references to ensure that claims made in the DEI statements are true. One interviewee noted that some job candidates may just be better ‘essayists’ than others but that crafting a better-sounding DEI essay than other candidates does not mean that the candidate is more accomplished in DEI work or has a stronger understanding of DEI concepts. An interviewee said, “I go out in the world, and actually do that, live it, and have to endure the ridicule and sometimes the negative feedback that comes along with it [but then] this
person is skating in on writing these beautiful statements that are not real, that are fantasy, and then they get
the job. They get the position they get the award, and then, next thing you know, they didn't deserve any of it.”
Two interviewees noted that DEI statements are often optional for applications and questioned how important
they can even be if they are not required components of applications, while four interviewees noted that they felt
requiring DEI statements in applications just provided yet another barrier for applicants of color. None of the
interviewees stated or suggested that DEI statements are important or should be required in academic librarian
applications, though one interviewee did say it would be “a huge red flag” if a job candidate explicitly denied the
importance of DEI statements.

All the interviewees shared thoughts on what they do not want to see in DEI statements, leading to this
being the second emergent theme: “buzzwords”. Three interviewees explicitly used “buzzwords” as a term for
something they do not want to see in DEI statements, though statements of seven others could be summarized
as objecting to ‘buzzwords.’ Interviewees also said they did not want to see “fluff,” “incohesion,” “overly dramatic
language,” “lies,” and “boilerplate.” One interviewee objected to out-of-context quotes, specifically from Martin
Luther King, Jr. Five interviewees objected to applicants stating in their DEI statements that they, “don’t see
color,” and mentioning having BIPOC friends or bi-racial relatives. Most of the interviewees noted that many
DEI statements seem constructed based on words and concepts found through google searches and therefore
seem repetitive, vague and cliché laden. One interviewee said they did not like to see DEI statements wherein
candidates are just listing out their own marginalized identities. Also, one interviewee objected to “over-citation”
in DEI statements, saying, “If you cite one thing, I’m fine. I don’t want seven definitions and seven citations, be-
cause I could have done that myself.” Of bad spelling and grammar in DEI statements, one interviewee said they
did not tolerate job candidates misspelling names, especially non-Anglo names.

Conversely, a third emergent theme was what the interviewees did want to see in DEI statements. An in-
terviewee who identified as Hispanic said, “I want to hear talk about anti-Blackness, like even among people of
color, like we still hesitate to talk about anti-Blackness.” Most of the interviewees noted that they wanted story-
telling or narratives of the job candidate’s actual accomplishments related to DEI, or storytelling about how the
candidate is affected by DEI issues. One interviewee said they prefer concise DEI statements that avoid “word
salad”; similarly, another interviewee said they liked DEI statements that had “brevity,” but also “thoroughness.”
An interviewee said that they believed that when candidates are being sincere in their statements, it “comes
through,” but that DEI statements needed to be sincere. One interviewee said, “If someone can, like, critically
reflect on their own actions, and then learn from them, I think, connected to accountability,” and championed
accountability is an element of a good DEI statement.

All the interviewees discussed things that they found odd or nonsensical about DEI statements, providing
the fourth emergent theme. An interviewee said it would “take a book” to capture the DEI-related complications
she has experienced in her LIS career, and she should not be required to write a superficial “fluff piece” DEI
statement for a job. Another interviewee said DEI statements often describe what organizations should not do
versus what they should do; he said this was, “not particularly helpful”; this interviewee also said he believed DEI
statements do not discuss DEI problems as things that need to be solved “so that we don’t have to keep talking
about them to the extent that we’ve had to” and that the lacking improvement is a problem. Four interviewees
discussed how different institutions wanting different content within DEI statements causes consistency issues
and generates emotional labor. There was also a shared concern among five of the interviewees that institutions
may request DEI statements from all librarian job candidates when they may only be necessary for some posi-
tions, namely supervisory or administrative positions.

A succinct fifth emergent theme centered on alternatives to requiring a DEI statement. Interviewees that
discussed either what their institutions do instead of requiring DEI statements or what they would prefer institu-
tions do instead of requesting DEI statements were in solid agreement: they wanted hiring institutions to craft
interviews in a way that would draw out DEI-relevant data from job applicants.

The sixth emergent theme was that the interviewees may have themselves harbored biases. Three inter-
viewees did admit that if a job candidate were white or from a ‘non-minoritized’ group, it affected how they
approached reviewing their DEI materials. These three interviewees conceded that with a white candidate, they
would pay particular attention to whether the job candidate understood positionality. A fourth interviewee
entertained that they might have bias when an applicant is white, but their statements suggested that this bias would be unintentional. Two interviewees inferred that they tried to negate bias, including not penalizing job applicants for such things as misspellings or using what might be considered dated vocabulary; one of these two interviewees insisted that job applicants should be shown ‘grace.’

Finally, the seventh emergent theme was that all the interviewees were able to identify prongs that would merit inclusion in a DEI statement rubric. The notable proposed prongs can be broadly described as: evidence of previous DEI work, evidence of experience working with or serving diverse populations, evidence of considering DEI when supervising and managing people (specifically regarding DEI statements for supervisory or administrative positions), openness to growing in the areas of DEI, ability to understand and approach DEI both theoretically and practically, ability to mentor, familiarity with the hiring institution and its track record and statements on DEI, understanding of job candidate's own positionality in DEI, knowledge of common DEI concepts and terminology, and ability to convey a cohesive and substantive message through a DEI statement.

Though not identified as an emergent theme, it should be noted that several interviewees questioned the competence of search committees and administrators to apply a DEI statement rubric or to fairly evaluate DEI statements. Said one interviewee: “I think the weird part for me is that this conversation is about 20 years too late, right? The fact that we’re just now realizing that people have no clue how to rate a diversity statement that’s been submitted to them, and that in a field where we know bias has really negatively impacted people's ability to get jobs and promotions, that we haven’t realized that in this one area that asking somebody for a diversity statement was a way to put a band-aid on a problem to me. That’s a huge issue for anyone requesting that type of statement. If you’re not going to rate it fairly, just like you were supposed to be rating the rest of the application, then why are you requesting it in the first place?” Another interviewee stated, “It would be a lot of emotional labor for them [people who understand DEI concepts] to be on search committees with people who are frankly not competent enough to evaluate those statements.”

CONCLUSION

The idea of this research originated from a casual internet review of published guidelines for Diversity, Equity, Inclusion (DEI) Statements for academic library job positions. Over nineteen faculty rubrics were found. That is, rubrics by which to judge diversity statements submitted with job application materials for faculty positions were discovered. However, only general faculty rubrics were discovered. A review of this sample found that there was not a single published academic library jobs diversity statement rubric that we could discover published online.

The authors met virtually and designed the project to include a survey of hiring managers, qualitative interviews of DEI library experts, and a content analysis on both the 13 qualitative interviews and 19 general faculty rubrics.

Unfortunately, only 16 complete responses to the survey of the hiring managers were received so a statistically significant number of responses could not be generated. Therefore, the survey was disregarded for purposes of our paper.

In this paper the authors reviewed the current state of faculty DEI rubrics by looking at examples from multiple universities. This was done to provide an orientation and perspective on DEI rubrics for academic librarian positions. The next endeavor for the authors is to create a best practices diversity statement rubric for the academic library field.
APPENDIX A.
Detailed Content Analysis for Convenient Sample of DEI Statements

PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

*Brandeis University* (Massachusetts) has published a Rubric for Evaluation Diversity Statements originally designed by the University of California System to evaluate diversity statements that may be summarized in a 3x5 matrix. The first rating concerns Knowledge about DEI, the second rating concerns Experience Working to Advance DEI, and the third rating concerns Plans for Advancing DEI. Within each of these ratings, points are allocated as 1-2, 3, 4-5 depending on characteristics of each level.

*Brown University* (Rhode Island) has published a comprehensive guide covering both Diversity Statements and Evaluation Rubrics, along with guiding questions to help develop the rubric. Their publication divides evidence demonstrating contributions to diversity into four categories which are the following: Knowledge and Understanding, Teaching, Research, Service/Professional Activities. They then provide three sample criteria for excellence. It is possible that each hiring committee develops its own rubric.

*Columbia University* (New York) has developed a rubric for Evaluating Faculty Candidates Diversity Equity and Inclusion Statements that promotes three primary rating criteria, namely: 1) Awareness of and ability to articulate...factors that influence underrepresentation of particular groups in academia...2) A track record calibrated to career stage, of engagement and activity....Strong evidence typically consists of multiple examples of action....3) Specific, concrete goals, plans, and priorities, calibrated to career stage, for engagement....A 1-2, 3, and 4-5 rating scale, with narrative examples, is provided for each of the factors of Knowledge, Track Record, and Plans.

*Cornell University* (New York) has developed the Rubric Assessing Candidate on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, with three major factors. These major factors are Awareness/Understanding of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Experience Promoting Diversity, Equity, Inclusion; and Plans to Advance Diversity, Equity, Inclusion at Cornell. Each of these major factors provides one-to-five criteria for scoring within the major factor.

The rubric for *Emory University* (Georgia) was adapted from the rubric of the University of California, Berkeley, to make it more applicable to technical fields such as Science, Engineering, and Technology. It contains basically the same matrix of criteria with adaptations that are described in a 5 x 3 matrix. Additionally, the rubric notes that "reviewers should use the rubric score and discuss the content of the DEI statement to holistically assess each candidate (i.e., the rubric score alone should not determine a candidate's ranking)."

The rubric offered by the *University of Colorado, Denver* provides a Glossary of the primary terms used in the rubric to facilitate understanding of its users. The rubric is 5-factors by 4-factors, two-dimensional matrix. One dimension is a rating scale with levels of poor, acceptable, good (two levels), and excellent. The other dimension is comprised of four categories which are the following: 1) Overview, 2) Knowledge: Cultural self-awareness, Attitudes: Curiosity and openness, 3) Knowledge: Knowledge of other cultural worldviews 4) Skill: Empathy. Example criteria are provided for each section of the rubric.

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

*Boise State University* (Idaho) has developed a Diversity Rubric that is composed of four (4) factors to be rated at four (4) levels of development with examples shown in a four-by-four matrix. These four factors are Knowledge of Diversity and Systems of Inequality, Analyzing Social Issues, Applying Knowledge of Diversity and Systems of Inequality to Social Issues, and Cultural Self-Awareness. These four factors are rated according to the following
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scale: 1-Unsatisfactory, 2-Developing, 3-Good, 4-Exemplary Work, with criteria definitions provided for each level of rating.

Bowling-Greene University (Kentucky) has adapted a rubric that is adopted from one developed by Virginia Commonwealth University which is an Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Statement Rubric. Their rubric is displayed in a x4 matrix, with one axis devoted to level of evidence (Lacking Evidence, Some Evidence, and Optimal Evidence) and the other axis devoted to Commitment Area (Knowledge, Awareness, and Application).

The Michigan Technological University offers a Diversity Statement: Evaluation Framework that recognizes “The stages (IDENTIFY, ANALYZE/RELATE, APPLY, CRAFT/DESIGN) demonstrate increasingly higher orders of thinking about diversity…” The rubric asks the rater to rate the applicant’s Diversity Statement at one of these levels, “indicating their highest level of demonstrated competence.”

Texas Technical University has published a Rubric for Evaluation of Diversity Statements from Faculty Candidates comprised of three major factors, which are the following: Knowledge About Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Track Record in Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; and Plans for Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Within each of these three major factors there are three point levels, those being 1-2 points, 3 points, and 4-5 points. Each of the points levels has associated criteria, those being 7, 1, and 4 for the first factor, 5, 4, and 6 for the second factor, and 4, 1, and 4 for the third factor. The rubric may be summarized with a matrix of three major factors and the above noted point allocation for each.

The University of California, Berkley provides a Rubric for Assessing Candidate Contributions to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Belonging that is shown in a 3 x 3 matrix. The three major headings of the rubric are the following: Knowledge about Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging; Track Record in Advancing Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging; and, Plans for Advancing Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging. The other matrix factor provided is a scale of possible score points for each of three levels of scoring, those being Score 1-2, Score 3, Score 4-5. Each score level is provided verbal descriptors of examples of appropriate scores.

The University of California, Davis rubric for Evaluating Contributions to Diversity Equity, & Inclusion (DEI) for Faculty Appointment, Promotion, Merit, & Appraisal notes that “There is no one size fits all approach to DEI contributions” in its section on Values, but also notes that “This rubric is not a checklist” and “This rubric is not exhaustive and is intended as a helpful tool.” The rubric is presented as a 4 x 6 matrix, which is divided into Areas of Assessment as one matrix factor and a ranking list of the following levels: Above expectations, Meets expectations, Below expectations, and N/A as the other matrix factor.

The Areas of Assessment include the following: 1) Research: Research contributions to diversity and equity, 2) Research: Research contributions to understanding the barriers facing women and historically marginalized groups in academic disciplines, 3) Teaching: Contributions to pedagogies addressing different populations, 4) Mentorship: Experience teaching, advising, and mentoring students who are historically under-represented, 5) University Service: Participation in service that applies up-to-date knowledge to problems, issues, and concerns of groups historically underrepresented in higher education, and, 6) Public Outreach. Specific examples of each category are provided in each intersection of the matrix factors.

The University of California, Los Angles offers its Guidance for Candidates-UCLA Equity, Diversity & Inclusion. Their guidance notes that Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion are key components of the University of California’s commitment to excellence. UCLA requests that the candidate provide an Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) statement that describes the applicants’ past, present, and planned contributions. The emphasis areas specified are Teaching, Research, Professional Activity, and University and Public Service, and criteria are specified under each of these categories.

The Office of Academic Affairs at University of California, Santa Cruz has developed its Rubrics to Evaluate Staff Contributions to Diversity Statements for review committees to use to evaluate staff candidate statements.
Their rubric is partitioned into three major factors; namely, Knowledge about Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Experience working to advance Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; and Discussion of advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the position. There are point levels available for 1-2, 3, and 4-5 with criteria specified for each range of points available.

The University of Maine at Augusta has developed a 4 by 4 matrix of guidance to evaluate a DEI Scholarship Statement Rubric. With point allocation as one axis and “Traits” as the other axis, the point allocation is noted to be 6-7, 4-5, 2-3, and 0-1. The Traits are noted to be Relates Personally to Importance of DEI Work; Knowledge about Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Organization; and Grammar. A paragraph explaining the relevant criteria is specified within each matrix element.

The University of Michigan has published a Diversity Statement Evaluation Rubric comprised of five (5) factors with each having two-to-five criteria identified for each. The five factors include Understanding of DEI in Higher Education, Research, Teaching and Mentoring, Collaboration and Leadership, and Service Engagement and/or Outreach. Each factor includes 4 or 5 bullet points about what is included in each factor.

The College of Engineering at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln has developed Diversity and Inclusion Statement Extended Rubric composed of three major Indicators, which are (A) Knowledge and Awareness, (B) Experience and activities, and (C) Plans. The three major indicators are further divided into (A) Aspects of diversity, Importance of inclusion, Consequences of inequality, Consequences of underrepresentation, (B) With students, Adapting teaching practices, Mentorship, research activities, etc. (C) Involvement with or creation of programs, initiatives, etc., that advance equity at the College and/or University, and Involvement with or creation of programs, initiatives, etc., that advance equity in the community, in K 12 settings, etc. Each matrix element receives a score noted to be (4) Exceptional or Clearly Addressed, (3) Adequate or Addressed Somewhat Clearly, (2) Fair or Addressed but Unclear, and (1) Poor or Not addressed.

The University of Virginia has designed a four-factor scale for Evaluating Statements on Contributions to Inclusive Excellence. The four scale factors are named Mentoring Activities, Service Activities, Research and Teaching, and Development Activities. A description of the information to be considered in each factor is provided for each of three types of positions—Faculty Positions, Patient Care Positions, and Staff and Management Positions.

The Office of the Provost at the Virginia Commonwealth University offers a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement Rubric that is comprised of three Commitment Areas, namely: Knowledge, Awareness, Application. Each area is rated under three levels: Lacking Evidence, Some Evidence and Optimal Evidence, with the highest level of evidence being a rating of multiple examples of each area.
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