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Session agenda

1. How BIDMC got started on equity journey
2. Measurement of culture
3. Tactics and interventions
4. Next steps
Caveats

• Reflection on the current environment
• One department at one institution
• I am not an expert
• This is not a typical story to tell at a meeting

Context: What we know about gender equity in medicine

• Women are promoted more slowly than men
  • Independent of research productivity
• Women are paid less than men for the same jobs
  • Independent of hours worked, type of clinical work
  • Persists despite knowledge of discrepancy
• Women are equally likely to get a first NIH award but then are less likely to submit another
• Women physicians have the same career aspirations as male counterparts
The background

• Spring 2014: women who lunch
• A biased sample
  • The need for administrative support

Background: The Story

Women who lunch
Background

• Learned about culture survey of academic medical centers from OB/GYN chair (research project)
  o National Initiative on Gender, Culture, and Leadership in Medicine = “C-Change Survey”
  o Second option exists; fewer domains: Westring et al
  o Wanted to assess many domains, not a gender equity survey


C-Change survey is a proven tool for academic medical faculty evaluation

• Validated survey with national norms
  o 23 medical schools including Cornell DOM
  o Repeatedly published

• Assesses 14 domains of culture

• Administered wholly by Brandeis for us
  o All faculty received email invitation
  o Anonymous
  o No divisional data used
  o No data shown for groups of <10 respondents

Pololi L, multiple pubs
Domains of Culture in C-Change

1. Vitality (being energized by work)
2. Self-efficacy: (being confident in being able to advance career)
3. Institutional support: (perception of institutional commitment to advancement)
4. Relationships, inclusion, trust
5. Values alignment
6. Ethical/moral distress (and being adversely changed by the culture)
7. Respect
8. Mentoring
9. Leadership aspirations
10. Work-life integration
11. Gender equity
12. URMM equity

A little bit about BIDMC

• Employment: HMFP; Work at: BIDMC
• Promotions: Harvard Medical School
• History:
  • BIH, Deaconess merger: 1995
  • Near-death experience: 2000
  • Full recovery and now rapid system expansion
    • 5-hospital system is growing faster than systems and staffing can catch up
• Data collection/data systems don’t talk
• We had not collected demographics on our department (ever? Since merger in 1995?)
Results were representative of DOM

- High response rate of 75% (310/413)
- Respondents match overall faculty composition wrt age, gender, rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BIDMC DOM Faculty Population</th>
<th>BIDMC DOM Faculty Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40 years</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54 years</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ years and older</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URMM*</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-URMM</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/Lecturer Male</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/Lecturer Female</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor Male</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor Female</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Male</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Female</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Male</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Female</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* URMM indicates underrepresented in medicine minority faculty.

Results for each domain and its components adds richness to data

- Additional data was available on all the items
  - Detail for 3-6 components per domain
  - Could analyze domains by age, rank, gender, academic focus and years at BIDMC
- Women scored worse than men on nearly every indicator, even compared to national averages for women
- Burnout scores are very high (~60% and higher than national averages)
Free text comments reflected the experiences of DOM faculty

- Hundreds of written comments tell story of faculty who are struggling, demoralized, and whose clinical productivity demands require many after work hours to keep up, because of resource-starved practices and faulty/inefficient systems
- Clinical productivity demands undermine ability to maintain academic life
- Conscious and unconscious bias toward women

“Biases against women faculty are largely unconscious but real. At the senior level the number of women is small. It doesn’t help that we have almost no photos of successful women anywhere. All the recent recruits at senior positions have been men.”
DOM C-Change survey demonstrated culture issues in multiple domains

- Survey confirmed gender equity issues
- DOM faculty experience is substantially below national average for academic medical centers in several domains
- The culture is likely preventing maximum productivity
- It is in BIDMC/HMFP/DOM’s interests to improve the culture for faculty physicians

DOM’s immediate response:

1. Clinical environment work group commissioned
   - Met with BIDMC leadership to share results
   - Now “BIDMC Experience”
2. Gender equity
   - Committee on Advancement of Women formed
   - Worked with HMFP on maternity leave
   - Shore Fellowship offered for FY17
3. Mentorship
   - Appointed Vice Chair for Mentorship
Background: The Story

- Providing data
- Making demands
- Hearing voices
- Women who lunch

Committee on Advancement of Women: Spring 2016

- Nomination and selection process across DOM
- Asked two male division chiefs to join
- Created summary document with requests/recommendations
  - Chair agreed to send a summary of that document to the DOM faculty
  - Chair agreed to all requests
Requests:

1. Salary equity assessment
2. Unconscious bias training for all leaders
3. Improvement in parental leave policy
4. Enhanced child care benefits
5. Make permanent commitment to Shore Fellowships
6. Create policy on department and divisional faculty meeting times
7. Augment promotion counseling, readiness assessment
8. Change the built environment to be more equitable
9. Require open announcements, selection processes for all leadership and funded positions
10. Create divisional and departmental equity Dashboards

Caution....

• You will inevitably leave someone out
• Is it inequitable?
  • Is a better solution to just take down all the photos that are currently up?
**Requests:**

1. Salary equity assessment
2. Unconscious bias training for all leaders
3. Improvement in parental leave policy
4. Enhanced child care benefits
5. Make permanent commitment to Shore Fellowships
6. Create policy on department and divisional faculty meeting times
7. Augment promotion counseling, readiness assessment
8. Change the built environment to be more equitable
9. **Require open announcements, selection processes for all leadership and funded positions**
10. Create divisional and departmental equity Dashboards

---

**Background: The Story**

- Women who lunch
- Hearing voices
- Providing data
- Making demands
- Women who lunch
Background: The Story

- Women who lunch
- Hearing voices
- Providing data
- Making demands
- Institutionalizing transparency

How did you get your current job?

- Women across our department complained about a lack of access to the “inner circle”
- Every leadership position was being given without a process (except national searches)
- Leadership positions did not have job descriptions, term limits, written agreements
Recommendation:

• Every position that included a title, money, or a leadership role:
  • Needed to be “posted” publicly within the division
  • Required a written job description
  • Should have a defined selection process

What do we know about hiring?
What do we know about hiring?

- People prefer those “like” themselves
- Unstructured interviews create unconscious bias, don’t differentiate candidates
- Group interviews create similar reviews
  - Individual interviews more likely to allow diversity of opinion about a candidate
- Having a comparand candidate is more effective than judging each individually
- Hiring in batches gets more diverse candidates
Results to date: Education roles

- Education roles (since 2015)
  - 24 funded roles offered (some in batches)
  - Selection committee for each role
  - Standardized application process/requirements
  - Standardized questions to ask (mostly)
  - Pull evaluation ratings, educational role info
  - Set timeline for interviews, selection process, notification date
- Applicants: 59 men, 31 women
- Positions: 13 given to men, 11 to women
  - Multiple URM candidates and selections

What have we learned about transparent hiring in education?

- Faculty appreciate the open process
  - Transparency
  - Opportunity
  - Learning opportunity
- Time consuming for leaders and staff
- Hard to tell people “no”
  - Heir apparent candidates
  - Repeat applicants
What have we learned across the department?

• This is major culture change
  • Variable commitment
  • New leaders
• Faculty have come to expect it
• Complexity:
  • Recruitment: when is it okay to offer a role to a junior recruit?
  • Retention packages: sometimes roles get invented
• Is there a standard/benchmark we should set?

Requests:

1. Salary equity assessment
2. Unconscious bias training for all leaders
3. Improvement in parental leave policy
4. Enhanced child care benefits
5. Make permanent commitment to Shore Fellowships
6. Create policy on department and divisional faculty meeting times
7. Augment promotion counseling, readiness assessment
8. Change the built environment to be more equitable
9. Require open announcements, selection processes for all leadership and funded positions
10. Create divisional and departmental equity Dashboards
“Not everything that counts can be counted and not everything that can be counted counts…”

But counting is a good start…

Creation of Equity Dashboards

• Planned to be annual data collection to track progress
• Would include gender, URM status for:
  • Demographics (gender, age, rank)
  • Leadership roles across DOM
  • Hires (candidates, positions, number conducted transparently)
  • Committee composition: Finance, Bridge, Education, Promotions
  • Visible conferences; awards; grant dollars
  • Departures
What have we learned about dashboards?

• Time consuming
• Data sources are hard to access or nonexistent
• Whose job is this – MD or admin leaders?

Next steps:

• Share data with leaders and then entire faculty
• Needs to become institutionalized as part of the expected work of every chief
  • It now sits in DOM QI
• Institutionalize tracking
• Request it become part of chief performance evaluation

Conclusions

• We don’t know if this will work!
  • Repeat culture survey? When?
• Work on transparency and equity is hard and time consuming
• This is culture change – treat it that way!
• Chance of success requires highly engaged sponsor
Recommendations for you:

- Survey your built environment
- Enhance transparency
  - Use known strategies to reduce unconscious bias
  - Make sure positions are open to all candidates
- Track internal data
  - Counting is a start
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