Welcome!

- Resources referenced during this presentation can be accessed through Canvas. In addition, a single PDF of resources was emailed to you, is linked in the calendar invitation and will be shared at the beginning of the workshop.

- For closed captioning, please look for the CC in the menu at the bottom of your screen and select “turn closed captioning on.”

- Please use the chat box for questions during the presentation. These will be answered during the Q&A at the end of the workshop.

Information about Today’s Workshop

- Interactive workshop
- Q&A at end
- Workshop resources available on Canvas site
  - Marked by a Canvas symbol
  - Access as we move through presentation, or later
  - Available to you all year
- Additional resources available at advance.umich.edu
  - Includes links to recommended literature

Poll: What is your role in your department’s hiring process?
STRIDE’s Approach to Faculty Recruitment

- The U-M ADVANCE Program began in 2002 to address faculty diversity and excellence.
- The STRIDE Committee, launched in 2002, has involved dozens of senior faculty members from across campus in thinking about recruiting a diverse and excellent faculty. Their mission:
  - To examine the research literature, and to think about how it applies to faculty searches;
  - To identify Michigan-specific strategies for effective searches;
  - To communicate these strategies to colleagues on search committees.

STRIDE Recommended Literature can be accessed via https://advance.umich.edu/stride-readings/

Changing Faculty Composition

- We are recruiting an increasingly diverse faculty, especially at the junior faculty level – but we have more work to do.
  - We’ve made more progress on gender than on racial/ethnic diversity.
  - We are an historically White university and remain so (U-M is 72% White).
  - Many of our fields are still dominated by one gender (U-M is 65% male).

- Where do we want to be in 5 years? In 10 years? What strategies can we use to get there?


Why Do We Want to Talk about Faculty Recruiting?

- Recruiting colleagues is one of the most important things we do.
- Having a diverse and excellent faculty is central to our success as an institution, and providing equitable opportunities is simply the right thing to do.
- Critically examining our hiring practices is hard work but is our chance to change the status-quo.
- We should approach recruiting in a scholarly way.

Overview of Today’s Presentation

What factors interfere with equitable searches?
What can research tell us about improving the search process?
How to apply evidence-based strategies to the four stages of the search process
Wrap-up and Q&A
How Bias Might Creep in: Individual and Structural Factors

Individual-level factors
- Schemas, stereotypes, prejudices
- Conscious or unconscious

Structural-level factors
- Policies, practices, reward systems
- Formal and informal

Structural Factors in Action in the Search Process

Formal policies and informal practices determine...
- who is asked to be on a search committee
- which/whose networks do you tap to find candidates
- how much you can spend on a search
- what are the “right” areas of research

Structural Factors

- **Formal policies**: rules about how things are done
- **Informal practices**: widely shared ideas about the “proper” way of doing things – often believed to be commonly known but can be opaque to “outsiders”
- **Reward systems** that determine what is valued in academia (e.g., grants, publications, awards)

- Created through individual actions
- Maintain the status quo
- Changed through individual or group resistance

How have you seen structural factors, such as policies and practices, affect searches?

*please use the chat box for your response*
Individual Factors in Action in the Search Process

Schemas (about race, gender, sexuality, disability, etc.)

- **Assumptions or expectations about groups** that influence judgments of them; stereotypes are one type of schema
- **Cognitive short-cuts**; allow rapid processing of information but susceptible to errors
- **Ubiquitous**; We all – regardless of the social group we belong to – perceive and treat people differently based on the social groups to which they belong.


Harvard Implicit Association Test: implicit.harvard.edu

Individual-Level Assumptions in Action in the Search Process

My evaluation of candidates may be influenced by...
- identity-based stereotypes about competence and intellectualism
- ideas about how a faculty member should look and sound
- whether we have common interests (would I like to have a beer with them?)
- where they got their graduate degree


How Schemas and Structures Thwart Fair Evaluations

**Evaluation Bias:**
- Favoring or disfavoring others based on job-irrelevant information (e.g., gender)
- Empirical support for evaluation bias based on different dimensions, e.g.
  - Social identity group
  - Area of study
  - Academic institution
- Often assessed with resume studies


Example: Bias Based on Parent Status and Gender

When evaluating equally qualified same-gender job applicants...

**Mothers...**
- were rated as **less** competent and less committed to paid work than non-mothers.
- were **less** likely to be recommended for hire, promotion, and management, and were offered **lower** starting salaries than non-mothers.

**Fathers...**
- were rated as **more** committed to paid work than non-fathers.
- were offered **higher** starting salaries than non-fathers.

Cornell et al. (2007)
Example: Bias Based on Race and Gender

- Male post-doc candidates rated as more competent and hireable than female candidates.
- White and Asian candidates rated as more competent and hireable than Black and Latinx candidates.
- In physics, Black women, Latinx women, and Latinx men rated as less hireable than all other groups.

Bias Can Be Based on Graduate Institution

- **Institutional Bias**: We privilege candidates from particular graduate institutions
  - Hiring individuals from just a select few institutions is common
  - Example: 42% of U-M College of Engineering faculty earned their Ph.D.s at just 5 institutions

Bias Negatively Affects Evaluations of Individuals from Many Groups

- Racial minorities
- Women
- Women parents
- LGBTQ people
- People with a disability
- Immigrants
- From less prestigious institutions
- Working outside the “center” of their discipline

Bias Can Be Based on Graduate Institution

- **Assumption**: Just a few “top” institutions produce the best scholars
- **Fact**: The number of papers published by early-career faculty is most closely linked to where they work, not where they trained
- **Action**: Prioritize the quality of the scholarship rather than the prestige of their Ph.D. institution
Bias Can Be Based on Area of Study

Subfield Bias:
- We privilege candidates working in the “center” of the field
  - Center may be determined by method, focus, sources, etc.
  - Often more diversity outside of the center
  - What are the up-and-coming, exciting new areas?
- We discount some scholarship as “me-search” when it appears personally relevant (e.g., Native American scholar researching health care for underserved communities)


Bias Can Be Based On Area of Study

• Scholars working outside the center of the discipline:
  – May publish in specialized journals
  – May have few who can evaluate their work (for hire, for tenure/promotion)
  – May not see themselves in narrow job ads

• Actions:
  – Be open-minded to the value of work in new areas
  – Prioritize the quality of the scholarship, seeking outside feedback if needed


Bias Can Be Based on Area of Study

• Black scientists funded at lower rates at NIH
  – 50% of applications from Black PIs were on just 11% of topics
  – These topics were reviewed at Institutes and Centers with lower award rates
• Topic affects citation counts
  – Areas where marginalized scholars are working are cited less

Image credit: Stevens et al., 2021

Chen et al., 2022 – Griffen et al., 2011 – Hoppe et al., 2019 – Kozlowski et al., 2022 – Lauer, 2020 – Lauer and Bernard, 2022 – Stevens et al., 2021

Other Places Prestige Bias May Emerge

Prestige differences in:
• Performance venues
• Project collaborators
• Awards and honors
• Grants and fellowships

MA-YI THEATER COMPANY

PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP

Albert Hourani Book Award
John and Yamila - University of Professorial Dreams: How Bias May Show Up in Conventional Search Practices

Committee notices that John is at prestigious R1 and they are friendly with most of his recommenders. Committee notices that Yamila is at a good R2 but questions whether she can make it here. They know her recommenders only by reputation.

Committee is impressed by the “center” journals John has placed his 5 publications in. Notes the small grant he has received for his work.

Committee is unfamiliar with the interdisciplinary journals Yamila has placed her 5 publications in. Notes the small grant she has received for her work.

Committee is not worried about John’s lack of service.

Committee admires John’s confident job talk presentation style and assumes he will be a good teacher.

Committee minimizes Yamila’s DEI efforts as a graduate student as self-interested.

Committee worries that Yamila’s accent will be hard for students to understand, even though they liked the content of her talk.

Change is Possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual-level factors</th>
<th>CREATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural-level factors</td>
<td>REINFORCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change can happen with:
- Awareness and understanding
- Resistance to status quo
- Effective strategies
- Sustained effort

Stages of the Search Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1.</th>
<th>Getting Great Applications from the Best Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2.</td>
<td>Achieving Excellence and Diversity on the Short List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3.</td>
<td>Managing the Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4.</td>
<td>Making the Decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equity-minded actions & Equity pauses

- Equity-minded actions: the focus of this workshop
- Equity pauses:
  - Intentional pause and assessment before moving on
  - Example: STRIDE attendance
  - Example: compare applicant pool demographics with the field, and adjust search strategy as necessary
  - Possible roles for search committee, department’s DEI committee, etc.

Recommended Faculty Search Committee Practices

Poll: How does your unit typically search for faculty candidates?

Better Way of Faculty Searching

Conventional Way of Faculty Searching

Define Searches Using Language Known to Draw Diverse and Excellent Applicants

Year round strategies
- Be a talent scout
- Bring potential candidates to visit
- Leverage postdoctoral programs to attract and mentor candidates

Search is a Verb:
MAKE YOUR SEARCH ACTIVE!

Design your search
- Develop language that emphasizes your unit’s DEI commitments
- Let everyone know: disciplinary publication, social media, potential candidates
- Widen your pool to a broad set of institutions

Strategies for Continuous Searching

- STRATEGY I - Avoid narrow specification of areas of expertise
  - Broad and open descriptions more effectively attract under-represented candidates.
  - Example: in one U-M department, broad and open searches led to a more diverse applicant pool, and hires from under-represented groups. And the ranking of the department improved.
- STRATEGY II - Recruit from subfields with diversity
  - Under-represented candidates often work at the margins of disciplines, or at the intersection between disciplines.
  - Consider areas that are expanding, attracting junior and under-represented colleagues.

Solicit Information About DEI Commitment

- Ask candidates to speak to their commitment to DEI:
  - opportunity for all applicants to discuss their record of, or potential for, contributing to DEI through scholarship, teaching, and/or service
- Could be a separate statement or integrated into existing components
- Feedback from some U-M units:
  - Helped identify candidates with significant and broad DEI commitments
  - Raised awareness among search committee and department of the impact of applicant’s work, and the importance of this issue

Sylvester et al. (2019)

Stages of the Search Process

- Stage 1. Getting Great Applications from the Best Applicants
- Stage 2. Achieving Excellence and Diversity on the Short List
- Stage 3. Managing the Visit
- Stage 4. Making the Decision

Conditions That Can Hinder Equitable Evaluations

- Stress from competing tasks
- Time pressure
- Ambiguity/incomplete information
- Lack of critical mass (solo status)

...and schemas can influence decision making.

Acknowledge Bias in Commonly Used Metrics

• Citation (citation counts, h-index) and journal (e.g. impact factors) metrics are often used as indicators of scholarly quality and impact.

• But they can be biased. Research on citation counts finds:
  - Men cite themselves more than women (1.7 times more self-citations)
  - Minoritized groups (race and gender) are cited less than White men due to topic and identity
  - Minoritized scholars produce more “innovation” (i.e., new links between scientific concepts) but this novel work is less likely to be cited

Hofbirk et al. (2020) – King et al. (2017) – Kozlowski et al. (2022)

Teaching Evaluations: Issues to Consider

• Instructors who are member of minority groups may be perceived as less credible.
  - In identical lectures, when the instructor referred to his partner as “Jennifer” or “Jason”, the “gay” instructor received five times as many critical comments as the “straight” instructor.

• U-M ADVANCE study (2015) found URM faculty (especially URM women) reported more instances of students: expressing anger, showing disrespect, and challenging their expertise in and outside of the classroom.


Other Ways to Assess the Teaching Record

American Sociological Association Statement (2019):

• …using student evaluations of teaching as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness in faculty review processes can systematically disadvantage faculty from marginalized groups.

• If used … should be considered as part of a holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness.

Instead:

• Track trajectories, evidence of reflection about pedagogy, curricular innovation, and commitment to engage students of diverse backgrounds.

• Ask: how can this candidate broaden and reinforce your unit’s teaching mission?

ASA Statement on Student Evaluation of Teaching

Develop and Use Specific Evaluation Criteria

• Discuss and define your criteria early in the process (before viewing applications).
• Carefully consider required vs. desired skills and experience
• Determine what evidence might show how well the candidate demonstrates the skills and experience in each criteria

• Broader your evidence: consider:
  - “Narrative CV” - candidates provide short statements about their scholarly contributions
  - Alternative indicators of impact, innovation, and quality (e.g., public scholarship, public policy, clinical impact)


- DORA (Declaration on Research Assessment) Project

Applicant Evaluation Tool - Interviewee Evaluation Tool - Diversity Statement Rubric
Evaluation Tools

Rate each candidate on the dimensions below. Is the evidence in each category: strong, moderate, weak, none?

Criteria: Evidence:

Commitment to DEI
- Teaching and mentoring students from marginalized communities
- Integrates anti-oppressive and anti-racist philosophies and practices into curricula and pedagogy
- DEI-focused service

Teaching effectiveness
- Curricular innovation
- Teaching evaluation data/letters from students
- Teaching philosophy emphasizes inclusive approaches

Scholarly impact
- Intellectual contribution to their relevant subfield
- Broader impact through public engagement, community outreach, etc.

Letters of Recommendation: Pros and Cons

Pros of letters of recommendation:
- can point out strengths of candidate
- can identify candidate's role in shaping the direction of the project, identifying and working with collaborators, etc.
- can identify candidate accomplishments that do not fit on a CV

Cons of letters of recommendation:
- letter writer's biases color what is (or is not) written
- may spend time on information that is irrelevant to the job and potentially harmful to the candidate
- sometimes are partly written by the candidates themselves

Poll: Which word or phrase would you find most compelling and important in a letter of recommendation?

Focus on the Evidence

- Center evaluation criteria throughout; provide reasons for evaluations. Make evidence of job-relevant qualifications and experiences central to deliberations.
- Matters that are not job-relevant (e.g., family status, sexual orientation) must not be considered by the search committee
- Delay global evaluations and summary rankings; acknowledge uncertainty
- Consider developing a longer short-list
Consider Carefully How Letters of Recommendation Influence Your Decisions

Race
White candidates:
- Repetition of standout adjectives (outstanding, excellent, etc.)
- "Competence" used in a positive way

Black candidates:
- "Competence" used more frequently and used in a negative way ("mere competence")

Gender
Men:
- Longer letters
- More standout adjectives

Women:
- More use of "grindstone" adjectives (conscientious, meticulous, hard-working)
- More references to personal life
- More "doubt raisers" (hedges, faint praise, and irrelevancies)
  “She is close to my wife”


How to Write a Letter of Recommendation

Develop Processes for Person-Specific Hiring

- Person-specific hiring: Consideration of a candidate who did not apply to a posted position. (Examples: some senior hires, dual career partners, special post-doc programs.)
- In recent years at U-M, the percentages of women and URM faculty hired have increased at the assistant professor level but decreased at the senior level.
- Recommendations
  - Employ a transparent procedure developed in advance.
  - Be sure to discuss vetting, visits, and standard to be met.
  - Do not allow time pressure to compromise the quality of your evaluation and deliberation.

Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring pp 10-12: Person Specific Hiring

Stages of the Search Process

Stage 1.
Getting Great Applications from the Best Applicants

Stage 2.
Achieving Excellence and Diversity on the Short List

Stage 3.
Managing the Visit

Stage 4.
Making the Decision

Univ. Michigan Tenure Track Faculty 2016 Indicator Report

Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring pp 10-12: Person Specific Hiring

We Want to See Job Candidates Show Us Their Very Best...

We should create an environment that elicits the best performance from all candidates.

Siblings and former Ann Arbor residents Maia and Alex Shibutani, Olympic and World Medalists in Ice Dancing
Managing the In-Person and Virtual Visit

Provide helpful information
- Visit schedule
- Family-friendly policies
- Departmental norms for seminars

Be thoughtful about environmental cues
- Seminar attendance
- Virtual tours

Consider accessibility and other needs
- Closed captioning
- Physical and Dietary needs
- Scheduling need

Facilitate positive interactions
- Pick a good host
- Provide welcoming seminar introduction
- Ensure candidate meets with a diverse range of people

Protect Against Job Talk Bias

During academic talks, women (vs. men) tend to get more:
- Interruptions
- Patronizing questions
- Hostile questions
- Follow-up questions

Gender bias holds even when controlling for years since PhD

To reduce job talk bias, add structure, reset norms:
- Designate a moderator to set ground rules, maintain respect, intervene if questions are derailing
- Ask that substantive questions be held until end
- Discourage demeaning or combative questions

Blair-Loy et al., 2017 – Pascaline et al. (2021)

Show off Your Department as It Is or As You Would Like It to Be

Who belongs here?

What can your department do to ensure you see candidates at their best?

(please use the chat box for your response)
Respect Candidate Privacy, and Consider Only Job-Relevant Criteria

- Interviews should aim to evaluate qualifications that are relevant to a faculty position – questions about matters that are not job-relevant (e.g., family status, sexual orientation) must not be asked by the search committee;
- Such questions are also often illegal: a chart of appropriate and inappropriate questions is available on page 8 of your Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring;
- Exploring non-job-relevant criteria will confound your evaluation, and is also likely to drive away the candidate.

ADVANCE interview study of faculty who turned down offers. Rivera (2017) - Sue et al. (2007)

Unintended Consequences of Personal Questions

Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring p. 8: Questions to Avoid

Stage 1. Getting Great Applications from the Best Applicants
Stage 2. Achieving Excellence and Diversity on the Short List
Stage 3. Managing the Visit
Stage 4. Making the Decision

Gather Input Promptly

- Promptly use the interviewee evaluation tool after each visit.
- Postpone global rankings. Aim first for an unranked list of candidates you would be most happy to hire.
  - Ranking cements positions before discussion takes place (“anchoring” or “focusing” effect).
- Don’t focus on “fit”, but rather on fitting the criteria you identified at the start of the search.

John and Yamila
University of Professorial Dreams finalists!
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Gather Input Promptly

- Promptly use the interviewee evaluation tool after each visit.
- Postpone global rankings. Aim first for an unranked list of candidates you would be most happy to hire.
  - Ranking cements positions before discussion takes place (“anchoring” or “focusing” effect).
- Don’t focus on “fit”, but rather on fitting the criteria you identified at the start of the search.

John and Yamila
University of Professorial Dreams finalists!
Are These Your Criteria?

- I never heard of that journal
- Do we really want that PhD institution listed on our website?
- Is that research? Or ME-search?
- She didn’t seem very sure of herself
- Is her husband moveable?

Manage Full Faculty Discussions

- Use a transparent process.
- Consider opening with brief presentation from search committee on all candidates.
- Summarize and contextualize evaluation materials for the faculty.
- Find ways to represent early career faculty views in the discussion.
- Decision-making processes vary. Reflect on how yours worked this year and consider revising to improve.

After an Offer is Made…

After a candidate is chosen, aggressive recruiting can begin.

Now, all factors relevant to attracting the candidate to U-M, Ann Arbor and southeast Michigan should be discussed.

Change can happen when…

Change can happen with:
- Awareness and understanding
- Resistance to status quo
- Effective strategies
- Sustained effort

Individuals create the structures and individuals change the structures
A Successful Search is Just the Beginning!

- **Build a culture of search excellence.** Reflect on your search and provide a report suggesting improved approaches for the future.

- **Work with colleagues to create a culture in which new faculty will thrive, succeed, and choose to stay at U-M.**

- The **ADVANCE Program** can help: [advanceprogram@umich.edu](mailto:advanceprogram@umich.edu)

PLEASE COMPLETE THE WORKSHOP EVALUATION, SENT VIA EMAIL

---

What is one thing you plan to do differently in the search process? *(please use the chat box for your response)*