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Introduction: Why Implicit Bias in Higher Education?

Colleges and universities around the world have experienced an increase in student activism over the last five years. The student unrest has surfaced as a response to political controversies both within and outside of the educational institutions themselves. Many of these student uprisings challenged anti-diversity thinking and expressed the need for greater inclusion efforts on campus. In 2014, the “I, Too, Am Oxford” student movement published testimonials from students who had experienced micro-aggressions as a result of stereotype bias on their campus. Likewise, students at the University of Cape Town led a campaign called #RhodesMustFall to tear down a statue that honored a colonizer—Cecil Rhodes in 2015. Moreover, hate crimes at the University of Missouri resulted in the formation of activist group, Concerned Student 1950, which was a catalyst for igniting student protests against racism across the United States. Yale students’ call to rename Calhoun College later that year was inspired by the success of South African and other U.S. students, national events such


as the Baltimore uprisings and the Charleston massacre, and their localized experience of racist aggressions on campus.\(^5\) By 2016 election of Donald Trump, the Brexit referendum, and the rising tide of xenophobia globally, made the issue of inclusion all the more pressing for marginalized students, whose sense of precarity became heightened in the aftermath of these events. Young peoples’ anxiety of living through these times escalated in 2017 and 2018 with the increased criminalization of black people, government threats to expel immigrants and DREAMers, the mass-arrests of children at the broader, neo-Nazi marches in Virginia, the targeting of gay and transgender people, and the flurry “liar” accusations cast onto the women who spoke out about sexual harassment. A short history of campus activism reveals that the politics and the practice of inclusion in diverse societies has and will continue to present unique challenges to institutions of higher education.

One recent incident in May of 2018, in particular, involving Yale graduate students is an example of the challenges of racism currently facing the Yale community.\(^6\) When a white student called the police (for the second time) on a black student who was napping in the common area of her dormitory, the event highlighted a longstanding pattern of racialized students being treated as intruders, rather than as students who belong at Yale. In the days following the incident, Yale President Peter Salovey, denounced racism on campus and affirmed that Yale would tackle racial


discrimination with “education and reporting.” The controversial deployment of implicit bias training, which administrators propose as a way to increase campus awareness, came under intense scrutiny by black graduate student activists who critiqued implicit bias as a conservative solution to the pressing concerns of racism on campus. Students criticized the administration for a university response that promoted the need for more implicit bias training. In an open letter, they wrote:

In the current list of immediate steps for heightening awareness of racism and implicit bias, which was emailed to the graduate community by Dean Cooley on May 15th, the need for university accountability remains unaddressed. The proposed reforms improve the accessibility of existing measures to address racism on campus, but do not provide the comprehensive change needed to dismantle the problem of systematic discrimination.

The message from black graduate students is clear: They do not believe that implicit bias trainings at universities will shield them from the pernicious and dehumanizing effects of white supremacy, neither will these trainings bring an end to explicit discrimination, racial targeting, and structural racism in higher education. These criticisms notwithstanding, Yale administrators, like their counterparts at universities across the world, continue to invest significant time and strategic planning into

---


8 Email from Dean of the Graduate School Lynn Cooley to All Yale Graduate Students, “Message from Dean Cooley,” 15 May 2018. The letter outlined 5 immediate next steps: 1. Provide implicit bias awareness training for all GSAS staff before the beginning of the 2018 fall semester. 2. Offer dedicated training session for all incoming graduate students on implicit bias awareness. 3. Train all Ph.D. students in teaching an inclusive classroom either as part of “Teaching @ Yale Day” or in the “Fundamentals of Inclusive Teaching” workshop offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning. 4. Have community-building sessions in the graduate student dorms hosted by GSAS deans and staff. 5. Streamline communications with the President’s Committee on Racial and Ethnic Harassment by providing the following email address: discrimination.harassment.complaint@yale.edu.

implicit bias awareness and trainings. Embodied on both sides of the debate, is the tension that is central to this report: what are the stakes of emphasizing implicit bias in higher education? What is gained, and what is lost?

As a reflection of recent societal trends, the effectiveness of implicit bias training as a means to ameliorate issues of belonging and the potentially life-threatening effects of racism and discrimination at university campuses around the world merits further examination.

Two of the primary goals of this conference are as follows: The first goal is to compile and review the definitions and debates within implicit bias scholarship for participants that are relevant to the demographics and specific challenges of their home institutions. The second is to begin an honest dialogue about the advantages and disadvantages of implicit bias training and chart a new way forward for the initiative that considers its limitations, which have been identified in the existing scholarship. If we agree to continue using implicit bias trainings within university contexts, then we should do so with attention to its flaws and orient ourselves towards a new understanding of implicit bias training that is attentive to how and for whom it is implemented, and how it might be buttressed with other anti-discrimination programming or initiatives. This involves evaluating existing programs and

---

brainstorming ideas for comprehensive solution-oriented plans to address discrimination in all of its forms at universities where they are ineffectual or do not exist at all. Universities that already have plans will be considered by peer institutions for improvement and best practices. Finally, Yale, as the hosting institution and as part of the overall meeting agenda, will share its scaffolded approach to implicit bias trainings and discuss how the graduate student activism of 2018 influenced the campus-wide conversation on of implicit bias training.

Part I: Defining and Describing Implicit Bias

Scholars and officials commonly use the terms “implicit bias” or “hidden bias” to refer to a set of unrecognized socially constructed beliefs that a person unwittingly carries with them as they navigate through our world. These beliefs are often rooted in racial, gender, class and sexuality-based assumptions about others. Experts believe that these beliefs and misinformed perceptions have harmful effects that can lead to discriminatory practices in law, business, and education, on the streets and in the public commons. The effects of such implicit perceptions amount not only to microaggressions and structural racism; in fact, they have also resulted in the harassment, policing, and death of targeted groups. This section provides an overview of the genesis of implicit bias in scholarship and new literature on the state of the field.

---

The intellectual origins of implicit bias are commonly attributed to a foundational text on the subject called *Blindspot: Hidden Biases of Good People* (2013) by Mahzarin Banaji and Anthony Greenwald. The book consolidates the conclusions that Banaji and Greenwald derived from their work on the Harvard-sponsored research project called the Implicit Association Test (IAT). Drawing on their training in social psychology, they developed IAT in 1995 to serve as a scientific method for collecting and measuring data about the associations that the brain makes immediately after encountering stimuli and its patterns over time. The book argues that “good people” hold beliefs that are biased; it maintains that if those people become aware of their biases then, they can change their behavior to bring their beliefs and behavior into alignment. The authors refer to this process as an act of “outsmarting the machine” in order to produce fairness in our daily interactions and behavior. While the IAT was initially designed to measure implicit racial biases among participants, given the increased popularity of the test over the last two decades, its founders have expanded the test to measure implicit bias among participating groups on other trending political issues, such as: weight, religion, sexuality, skin-tone, weapons, disability, gender, age biases. They have also developed bias tests for target racial groups in addition to the original black-white test, now including: Arab Muslim, Asian American and Native.
American. Since the 2016 presidential election, IAT researchers have even developed a presidential popularity bias test, which measures the ability of participants to recognize images of Donald Trump or other previous presidents.\textsuperscript{15} IAT researchers interpret the results of each test and the various patterns across multiple tests by drawing on research from other institutions like University of Washington, University of Virginia, Yale University and Harvard University, that each have formalized implicit bias studies.\textsuperscript{16} Scholars today still maintain that “implicit bias” is a socio-psychological term that names “the phenomenon by which we are unaware of our prejudices.”\textsuperscript{17}

Although research on implicit bias has been the focal point of scientific analysis and experimentation since the 1990s, it has only recently become a part of national and institutional dialogues. An NPR article that interviewed Banaji entitled “How Implicit Bias Came Into Being,” argues that the high-profile police killings of unarmed black men, like Trayvon Martin in Florida in 2013, made use of implicit bias to explain the psychological underpinnings of the behaviors that could have precipitated these events, making the term popular among pundits, politicians and authority figures.\textsuperscript{18} Moreover, Hillary Clinton’s invocation of the term in the 2016 U.S. presidential debate to explain incidences of racial policing elevated further the high-profile nature of the

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} The disclaimer Project Implicit website indicates that the website draws its conclusion from the research of other institutions, see: https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html
term. The 2016 presidential race was not the first time that racial bias was leveraged in U.S. elections. In the 1988 George Bush Sr.-Michael Dukakis presidential race, Bush relied on the racial bias of his supporters when used the case of Willie Horton in campaign ads and speeches to argue that Dukakis was weak on crime.\(^\text{19}\) Put simply, critical incidences of racial violence against racialized people in the United States, the Black Lives Matter movement, and liberal responses to both have ushered in a new faith in implicit bias as a means to explain, and at times elude, one’s complicity in the racism and racial violence that drives Americans farther and farther apart.

Since its sudden popularity, implicit bias has come to represent the cornerstone of institutional diversity and inclusion programing to address long-standing racial and gender disparities at schools in and in the workplace. The proliferation of teaching materials, seminars, trainings, events and publications on implicit bias have led to contentious debates about the topic that interrogate all aspects of its meaning, its application, and its efficacy. It is important to note that there are previous iterations of twentieth-first century anti-discrimination programing, namely affirmative action which busied schools in the 1960s and 1970s, respectively. These were the institutional outcomes in response to the imperatives of the Civil Rights Movement and student activists’ demands for racial justice and gender equity within the academy throughout

the last quarter of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{20} In the 1980s, cultural critic, Kelefa Sanneh, argues that as universities repurposed their affirmative-action programs as diversity programs, the function changed from one of compensatory justice to a malleable idea of shared benefit.\textsuperscript{21} Today, diversity programming has employment implicit bias as a method of explaining as a root cause of racial and gender bias and raising awareness as a strategy for contending with biases in hiring, tenure review, student selection, teaching and interpersonal interactions. Furthermore, with the diminishment of many proactive efforts to diversify the academy, often as a result of changes in legislation (such as Proposition 209 in California which declared many affirmative action policies unconstitutional), many universities have increased their reliance on implicit bias training and awareness to address the campus climate challenges and structural racism and sexism. However, the effectiveness of this greater reliance on such training remains to be seen.

Within these discourses, implicit bias is commonly portrayed as interchangeable with unconscious bias or hidden bias. One article explains, “implicit bias is the way that social psychologists refer to the phenomenon by which we are unaware of our prejudices.”\textsuperscript{22} A “State of the Sciences Report on Implicit Bias” from the Kirwan Institute at Ohio State University explains further; “These biases, which encompass both favorable and unfavorable assessments, are activated involuntarily and without an

\textsuperscript{20} Martha Biondi, \textit{The Black Revolution on Campus} (Univ of California Press, 2014).
\textsuperscript{22} Sen, “COLORLINES CLASSIC.”
individual’s awareness or intentional control. Residing deep in the subconscious, these biases are different from known biases that individuals may choose to conceal for the purposes of social and/or political correctness. Rather, implicit biases are not accessible through introspection.”23 Hence, scientists conclude that implicit biases are deeply ingrained and sometimes pernicious thought patterns that are difficult to exorcise from human cognition.

A study on unconscious bias within higher education undertaken by British scholars, contends that implicit bias and unconscious bias are not the same. They draw a distinction between the two insofar as they are similar but have different means. They argue that unconscious biases are ones that we are completely unaware of; and they “happen outside of our control.”24 Whereas implicit bias takes into consideration the degree to which bias is unconscious as people become increasingly aware of them.25 These scholars contend that a definition of implicit bias that takes into consideration the process of knowing and learning about implicit bias itself makes people more accountable for their cognition. They write, “Once we know that biases are not always explicit, we are responsible for them.”26

In 2013, Maya Wiley, the president of the Center for Social Inclusion, contended that the notion of implicit bias field needs further, deeper exploration in real world

25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
scenarios. Wiley and others have pointed out that because civil rights legislation did not account for unconscious levels of racial animus, racism was always defined through the lens of intent and the legal standard of proof was an explicit, egregious act of hatred. In an interview, she noted that “we don’t understand our brains on race now.” Implicit bias could be a way of understanding how racism operates in the United States, especially with regard to its causes and effects. But Wiley and prominent scholars of psychology and race like, Yale Professor Jennifer Richeson, believe that in order to approximate how hidden bias sustains discrimination and violence against unarmed black people in the United States, the scholarship on implicit bias must be more explicit, even fearless, about scrutinizing how the concept itself exonerates racists by making them feel like their thoughts are natural rather than constructed. In doing so, implicit bias, as a field can be deeply problematic, as it tends to obscure racist structures in America and displace the culpability of perpetrators. Yale scholars, Daumeyer, Onyeador and Richeson refer to the disparities between implicit and explicit bias, which have been reified by the U.S. legal system, as “the accountability gap.”

Richeson et al.’s scholarship further examines the limitations of the extant scholarship on implicit bias as well as the danger of its growing popularity. They argue

---

27 From an interview on MSNBC with Maya Wiley, the clip is available on Youtube here: CtrSocInclusion, *In 2 Min, Maya Wiley Explains Why the Law Fails to Deliver Justice for Trayvon Martin*, Up with Steve Kornacki (MSNBC, 2015), https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=bU590o8SFU8.

28 Sen, “COLORLINES CLASSIC.”

that implicit bias shifts attention away from individual hearts in creating racial bias by focusing on individual minds. The emphasis on the individual, who according to the doctrine of implicit bias is framed as a helpless victim to his/her/their thoughts and actions, is misplaced and holds them less accountable for their discrimination. Moreover, implicit bias becomes something that they possess, rather than something that they experience.\(^{30}\)

Given these critiques, Richardson and her team posit that implicit bias studies must refocus attention on the “social contexts that promote biased mental associations.”\(^{31}\) Without attention to the socio-contextual factors that influence behavior, implicit bias is shallowly understood. Moreover, studies of it will continue to divert much needed scholarly attention away from the role of societal and structural biases such as stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. According to the group, implicit bias measurements become meaningful when analyzed relationally to empirical statistics such as measures of societal inequality.\(^{32}\) In an application of this analytical method, a study revealed that aggregate levels of implicit bias in cities predicted disparities in police shootings.\(^{33}\) When employed contextually, implicit bias scholarship reveals the intricacies of discrimination.

Although implicit bias and discrimination are not the same, scholars believe that there is a relationship between the two practices. The Prejudice and Intergroup
Relations Lab at the University of Wisconsin, Madison finds that implicit bias is forged through a sustained and “repeated exposure to stereotypes,” which are a form of discrimination. Likewise, Harvard’s Project Implicit shows how the effects of implicit bias can be circular and self-reinforcing. On the front end, implicit bias is believed to be produced by stereotypes and discrimination that are prevalent in society. And on the back end, “implicit biases can [also] lead to discriminatory behavior” according to the Project Implicit study. A Stanford study agrees that implicit bias can function like an automatic loop, arguing that dehumanization produces implicit knowledge and that implicit bias may contribute to “real-world social injustices.”

Researchers from University of Wisconsin at Madison, Harvard, and the University of Virginia may oppose this view on implicit bias. After evaluating 499 studies over 20 years involving 80,859 participants that used the IAT and other tests, they concluded that the correlation between implicit bias and discriminatory behavior was weaker than they anticipated. As a result, they question whether implicit bias has anything to do with an individual’s behavior. If true, this interpretation creates
challenges for the field of implicit bias and the usefulness of implicit bias trainings at universities and elsewhere.

Current debates in implicit bias scholarship have left out several factors that undergird the preponderance and perpetuation of implicit bias in society. The debates have discounted history and the socio-historical factors as forces that create and maintain implicit biases. Due to this oversight, the theory of implicit bias is misunderstood because it does not sufficiently consider the sustained history of white supremacy in the United States. However, the United States is not an exception. In an international context, most Western nation-states are also the beneficiaries of colonialism, slavery, and white settler violence, including: Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and many European countries. Those who were disenfranchised by these processes and attendant national policies such as Maori, Aboriginal, Asian and Pacific Islander people, still continue to face legacies of oppression, exploitation, and discrimination. Hence, beyond infusing implicit bias studies with contextual analysis, implicit bias scholarship must become more interdisciplinary, drawing insights from the range of ways in which a factor akin to race operates as “simultaneously social, ideological, political, religious, and epistemological.”39 Historical analysis could be fruitful for the debate. For example, on the topic of racial bias, social psychologists portray these biases as inherently human rather than as a particular response to a politics of colorblindness that emerged in the post-Civil Rights era. As a historian, I

would investigate implicit bias as the byproduct of white supremacy’s hegemony in politics, culture, and science. I argue, that implicit bias helps to explain how white supremacy is able to exist in a world where white supremacists are a minority. Therefore, attention to history as a method of analysis could show that implicit bias is a byproduct of liberal attitudes and racist politics of the post-1960s era in the United States and the world. Without an interdisciplinary approach that mutually informs the disciplinary blind spots in history and psychology, I contend that implicit bias theory and its remedies will always be lacking. One author, more optimistically argues that dialogue between the two disciplines on this topic will “reveal further the deep rootedness of racial associations, of structural racial oppression, and legally condoned anti-black violence.”

Part II: Implicit bias and its Intersections

Implicit bias manifests itself in a multitude of ways depending on presumptions about race, gender, class and sexuality. Common examples of implicit bias cite that a moderate preference for white faces over other faces with non-European features is a form of racial bias. Implicit bias expert, Mahzarin Banaji, said that implicit bias testing revealed entrenched associations such as one’s propensity to link the concept of whiteness and white people with “good” things while linking blackness and black

40 Ibid
41 Ibid.
people with “bad” things. Upon realizing that you have a bias, Banaji recollects having a minor personal crisis. She said, “you come face to face with the fact that you are not the person you thought you were.”

Leaders and activists such as Maya Wilder, president of the Center for Social Inclusion, analyze the implications of such biases outside of experimental settings. Wilder concludes that these biases are so powerful that they produce unjust and deadly outcomes. Wilder cites the chilling statistic about racist criminalization in America, showing that “white people are more likely to shoot a black man with a wallet than a white man with a gun.”

Implicit bias is not only limited to racial bias and latent racism; researchers and professionals also highlight how it can function as gender bias. One pedagogue argues that in a world where “80 percent of the national political leaders are men, 95 percent of the prominent business leaders are men, 70 percent of the established scientists and engineers are men, and 85 percent of the police officers are men,” a person’s perception of authority would be masculine because they have witnessed men in authority positions most of their lives. Under these circumstances, scholar David

---

43 Sen, “COLORLINES CLASSIC.”
Gobblar author of “Yes, You Have Implicit Biases, Too” reveals how the perceptions of men assumed as more qualified than women become ubiquitous.44

A number of studies also reveal that implicit bias can be at play in fostering unfair judgments about individuals based on their sexuality or sexual orientation. These studies focus primarily on the health care industry where health care providers express “moderate to strong implicit preferences for straight people over lesbian and gay people are widespread among heterosexual providers,” according to one American Journal of Public Health study.45

In addition to Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transsexual-Questioning (LGBTQ)46 people, implicit bias also has a strong impact on women, non-gender conforming, immigrants, and people of color who are the victims or subjects of other peoples’ assumptions about their morality and capabilities. Gobblar argues that from their perspective implicit bias erodes their confidence in themselves and their abilities in classroom settings and beyond.47 One study of mentorship and advising in the academy echo these conclusions, showing that implicit or unconscious racism affects the

---

46 The United States uses the acronym “LGBTQ” to refer to queer people. In Europe the acronym “LGBTI” is commonly used with the “I” representing “intersex.”
47 Ibid.
academic performance of students of color. Beyond academic performance, some have also called attention to implicit bias in college disciplinary systems, arguing that the data showing racial disparities in K-12 discipline might be a pattern that extends to college, should the university decide to record this information.

New directions in the research on implicit bias in universities will need to include biases that international students and first-generation college students might experience. With exploration of new and uneven biases, practitioners should explore how intersectional identities such as, being both Latina and gay or black and international, produces different types of unconsciousness and attendant discriminatory structures.

Part III: IARU Institution-specific Implicit Bias Mitigation Practices

Overall, the IARU participant survey indicates that all participating universities generally understand the meaning of implicit bias, concur with the definition provided, and grasp the significance of implicit bias awareness to the vitality of the university, albeit to varying degrees. The following graph shows how university representatives

---


self-reported their understanding of implicit bias. It has been the aim of this report to complicate our understandings of implicit bias by showing how varied and discordant extant scholarship on the topic is.

In the charts that follow, the majority of respondents indicated that their institution’s implicit bias programming is part of a larger diversity strategic plan. While most participants agreed that implicit bias awareness was moderately to very important to their respective institution.
Presence of Strategic Diversity Plan

- Yes: 71%
- No: 29%

Importance of Implicit Bias Awareness

- School F: 4
- School C: 6
- School A: 7
- School D: 7
- School B: 9
- School G: 9
- School E: 10
The most variability between participants was in the availability of implicit bias training for staff, students, faculty search committees, post-docs, student admissions, and faculty promotion committees. These results, which are outlined in the Appendix, reveal that each university has provided uneven resources and opportunities for implicit bias training. Despite such variability on the types of training that are offered and for whom, more than half of the respondents indicated that of the implicit bias trainings that are offered, most of them are an optional and not a mandatory part of professional development.

The goals of this conference were tailored around these results, focusing specifically on implicit bias scholarship, innovative practices, and student challenges to university implicit bias programming. One area where all participants can benefit is to determine how to tackle the challenges that arise when implicit bias training programs are either inadequate or not mandatory for the general campus community.

IARU Participant Spotlights:

U.C. Berkeley emerges as the institution with the clearest and most centralized comprehensive strategic plan for addressing implicit bias awareness, and all of its resources are publicly available. In short, its three-pronged strategy includes: developing responsive research, teaching and public service by focusing specifically on
equity, inclusion and diversity; expanding pathways for access and success to all students, faculty and staff; amending campus conditions to create and sustain a healthy campus climate.

Copenhagen’s plan emphasizes diversity (defined as gender equality) rather than implicit bias explicitly. The institution has two approaches for ameliorating gender imbalances in faculty. The first is an action plan focused on encouraging more women to apply for positions and providing them with non-financial incentives. The second encompasses different initiatives to support their research.

One of Oxford’s noteworthy programs is its implicit bias workshops, which are available to all departments and staff members within the institution. The workshop is a one-time two-hour program facilitated by a team of volunteer experts that explores the origins of implicit bias, its manifestations at Oxford and practical steps for reducing one’s own implicit bias. Oxford will also offer an online version of this training available to people of the Oxford community. More significantly, is that implicit bias workshops are just one of a few of anti-discrimination workshops at Oxford. Others that are related to implicit bias include: the Athena SWAN initiative, which emphasizes the need for gender equality across the University, and the Race awareness workshops

---

50 For detailed information on Oxford implicit bias workshops, see: https://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/eop/race/whatsgoingon/workshopsandtraining/implicitbias/
that extend from the national policy agenda of the Race Equality workshop which exposes participates to ideas about racial discrimination and structural bias.\textsuperscript{51}

In late 2016, the Bertha Center for Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship at the University of Cape Town’s Business School held a multi-site workshop on “Hair, Implicit Bias and Cultural Intelligence” in the aftermath of South African students’ most vigorous wave of activism against their university and school administrations since the end of apartheid. The conference targeted pedagogues of all levels and challenged them to consider that the student protests were a response to the cumulative impact that implicit bias has had on schools in South Africa. One question, for example, encouraged teachers to consider: “What are the implicit and unconscious biases we as staff hold that are shaping our school cultures and impacting on the learning environments we seek to create?” The workshop also explored inherited or hidden biases in codes of conduct, how to create emotionally literate environments in schools, and increase teachers’ cultural intelligence to help them transform their praxis from one of assimilation to one of inclusion.\textsuperscript{52} The effects of the Betha Center workshops have since been difficult to measure. Following the workshop series, the Center concluded that implicit bias and cultural intelligence work is an “ongoing process and workshops like this are only the beginning of what is to be a long journey on the road to culturally

\textsuperscript{51} For detailed information on Oxford race awareness workshops, see: https://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/eop/race/whatsgoingon/workshopsandtraining/raceawareness/

intelligent and open schools. Although participants didn’t leave with all answers, they left with a better understanding of where and how to start.”

The Yale Graduate School of Arts and Sciences’ Office for Graduate Student Development and Diversity (OGSDD) led optional implicit bias awareness sessions for graduate students. This is one part of a multi-pronged initiative within OGSDD to promote diversity and inclusion at Yale. Other aspects of the Office’s work include: the social justice discussion seminar series, 4-tier Mentoring Program, the Emerging Scholars Initiative to provide support for prospective, incoming, and matriculating graduate students, diversity recruitment, a Post-Bac Research Program and advising. Faculty search committees have been exposed to implicit bias awareness through the Yale’s Provost Office. Other centers at Yale target the undergraduates for diversity programming more specifically. These include the cultural centers, minority student coordinator appointees, and resources for LGBTQ, women, and international students. Moreover, Yale’s Center for Teaching and Learning offers online resources for promoting awareness about implicit bias for graduate teaching assistants. Faculty organizations across campus, such as the Minority Organization for Faculty Recruitment and Retention (MORE) in the Yale School of Medicine have made great strides in making all faculty feel included and advocating for better climate and aggressive efforts to address structural racism, sexism, and all other challenges of inclusivity. These along with a number of faculty hiring, promotion and tenure

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
initiatives for diverse faculty constitute the diversity and inclusion programming at Yale.

Part IV: Implicit Bias at non-IARU Universities

There are a few notable implicit bias migration efforts and techniques that have been implemented at non-IARU universities in the United States. Viewing these initiatives alongside the ones at IARU universities, we form a more complete picture of the creative uses and possible futures for implicit bias. At Carnegie Mellon, faculty search committees are required to undergo trainings, read implicit bias scholarship, and craft the committee's search process with a distinctive focus on implicit bias in evaluation criteria and their decision-making processes.54

The University of California schools offer a six-course online implicit bias training seminar for all UC staff members for whom the seminar is a core requirement. The six-course structure gives staff multiple points of reference about implicit bias and builds on what they’ve learned with each session.55

Dartmouth College seeks to disrupt implicit bias in teaching and classroom environments. It’s Center for the Advancement of Learning offers resources,

workshops, consultations and classroom visits to promote inclusive teaching in lectures and seminars at Dartmouth.56

Conclusion

Implicit bias, if left unaddressed at universities, will continue to reproduce an inequitable and non-inclusive status quo. The cumulative effects of small decisions that are implicitly racist, homophobic, and sexist maintain systemic discrimination and effect the experiences of all students. If investigated thoroughly, implicit bias has the potential to intervene in the ways in which structural racism is identified and reproduced at colleges and universities. However, these efforts are stymied when implicit bias is used to protect the ill-intended or obscure the many other ways that discrimination operates in society.

Universities invest resources in implicit bias and implicit bias trainings because they believe that implicit bias will contribute to removing the barriers to creating a diverse and inclusive campus. This report has shown that while implicit bias is useful concept for raising awareness about unconscious knowledge, ample research will need to be done to demonstrate convincingly that implicit bias trainings can promote better decision-making among its trainees.

Administrators and practitioners must acknowledge the limitations and implications of increased university focus on implicit bias, many of which were outlined in this report, including: displacement of diversity and affirmative action programming, underestimation of entrenched racism without attention to socio-contextual and historical factors, and research findings that sometimes report weak correlations between implicit bias training and changes in behavior. More importantly, universities need to consider that implicit bias often explains a small self-selecting demographic of people who are generally liberal on social and cultural matters. While universities invest resources into this limited group, overt racism will continue to threaten campuses climates, discriminating against black, brown, and other marginalized students.

As such, we must begin to think creatively and collaboratively about how to fill in these gaps and combat the persistent problem of discrimination on campus. Graduate students on campus at Yale, University of Cape Town, UNC, and Oxford have already begun this work by speaking out against these injustices. It is now up to administrators to advocate vociferously for the most marginalized members of their campus communities. Administrators can do this by re-committing themselves to a vision of uncompromising equity and tailoring university policies and programming to that end. There is ample hope for higher education institutions which can be bastions for researching and combatting fear-based anti-diversity thinking. Sharon Davis, executive director of the Kirwan Institute says, “But this is not inevitable. To be
effective, colleges and universities must begin with a clear-eyed look at themselves, and then put into place mechanisms of change that are responsive to students’ criticisms.”

---

Appendix

Presence of Strategic Diversity Plan

- Yes: 71%
- No: 29%

How Well Do You Understand Implicit Bias

School A: 5
School B: 5
School C: 6
School D: 7
School E: 9
School F: 9
School G: 10
Importance of Implicit Bias Awareness

Availability of IBT to Student Admissions Committees
Availability of IBT to Those Making HR/Staff Hiring Decisions

- Yes: 43%
- No: 57%

Availability of IBT to Students

- Yes: 14%
- No: 86%
Availability of IBT to Post-Doctoral Fellows/Scholars

- Yes: 29%
- No: 71%
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