

2023

# OIE Best Practices Toolkit

## Faculty Recruitment



## Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Equity Advisors as Search Consultants .....  | 3  |
| Search Process Steps Engaging Equity Advisors .....  | 4  |
| The Search Process Part I - Equity Advisor Engagement in Senate Faculty Recruitments ..... | 4  |
| Search Process Part II - Search Chair and Committee .....                                  | 6  |
| Search Process Part II - Review Completed Applications .....                               | 7  |
| Search Process Part II - Developing a Short List .....                                     | 7  |
| Search Process Part III - Selection and Hiring .....                                       | 7  |
| Guidance for Virtual Interviews .....  | 9  |
| Best Practices for Interactions with Candidates .....                                      | 9  |
| References .....   | 11 |

## Equity Advisors as Search Consultants

Equity advisors are senior faculty members who are appointed as faculty assistants to their respective deans in each academic unit. Equity advisors participate in faculty recruiting by approving search strategies and raising awareness of best practices. Additionally, they organize faculty development programs, with both formal and informal mentoring, and address individual issues raised by women and underrepresented minority faculty.

A current list of equity advisors is located at: <https://inclusion.uci.edu/advance/equity-advisors/>. The equity advisors have responsibilities that range from consultations with faculty search committees on recruitment matters and official sign offs in the recruitment process to quarterly reporting and annual training on topics that advance inclusive excellence at UCI.

Specifically, there are key points in any faculty search process when equity advisors must be engaged with search chairs and committees. These include presenting guidance on best practices to all search committees and reviewing and approving specific milestones in the Senate faculty searches (recruitment plans, short list of interviewees, and final committee selections). Additionally, key best practices during the search process also include making time for candidates to meet with equity advisors for confidential conversations about candidate questions and advice on UCI family friendly policies, practices, and institutional supports for faculty career success.

| Recruitment  | Coordinate Career Advising   | Promote Equity and Retention   | COVID-19 Guidance   | ADVANCE Program Advising Committee  |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet with Search Committees</li> <li>• Review compliance w/ads, committee composition, equity practices</li> <li>• Confidential meeting with candidates</li> <li>• Approve outreach plan, shortlist, final selection</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure new faculty orientation</li> <li>• Junior and senior faculty mentoring</li> <li>• Offer welcome for all new faculty</li> <li>• Establish support networks for career guidance</li> <li>• Cultivate leadership</li> <li>• Raise awareness re equity and inclusion in awards/recognition</li> <li>• Collaborate with professional societies</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review salary equity data</li> <li>• Provide consultations (confidential) as requested by faculty</li> <li>• Assist dean in file review for faculty equity</li> <li>• Advise dean and central administration re: inequities</li> <li>• Disseminate mentoring best practices</li> <li>• Promote career development programs for graduate students and faculty</li> <li>• Coordinate with DECADE Mentors</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consult as requested re reasonable accommodations due to COVID-19 circumstances</li> <li>• Communicate campus resources for support</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly collaborations and annual trainings on DEi topics specific to role</li> <li>• Track DEi activities</li> <li>• Resource on ADVANCE program offerings</li> </ul> |

## Search Process Steps Engaging Equity Advisors

A summary of the major steps involved in the faculty search appears below and in Academic Personnel recruitment procedures for Senate positions (<https://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/open-search-process-senate/>).

These steps provide opportunities for search committee members to consult with equity advisors, including at the required steps\* where equity advisors present to Senate search committee members (Step 2), approve the search plan (Step 3), and approve the short list of candidates (Step 6). Steps include:



### The Search Process Part I - Equity Advisor Engagement in Senate Faculty Recruitments

The following steps provide opportunities to collaborate with equity advisors to inform:

- the scope of Senate faculty searches by reviewing recent hiring activities
- strategies for intensive outreach and anticipated search plans (equity advisor approval of search plan is required)
- search committee composition
- successful timing of the mandatory Equity Advisor search presentation

## Equity Advisor approves Position Advertisement/Search Plan

- All ads for Senate positions must include the following sentence:  
"Complete your application by also submitting a statement on previous and/or potential contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion."

## All search plans must include or address the following:

- Select "Statement on Contributions to Diversity" in the Required Documents.
- The following sentence must appear in the Recruitment Description: "Candidates must submit a statement on previous and/or potential contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion."
- Provide a description of search and recruitment activities in the section Planned Search & Recruitment Efforts to generate a diverse applicant pool; may consult equity advisor
- Include Selection Criteria and Selection Plan

## Selected Best Practices Related to Faculty Candidate Outreach and Early Search Steps

Evidence from the literature supports the best practices for the early stages of faculty recruitment that are referenced above. These selected best practices support the development of inclusive applicant pools and fair candidate appraisals.

### Faculty Search Advertisements

Flory et al. (2021) - Tailored recruitment messages that include the organization's valuing of diversity and evidence significantly and positively related to increased applicant and new hire diversity

Stacy et al. (2018) - Shaping the faculty job advertisement to align to desired jobs as well as diverse applicant interests has the highest correlation to faculty diversity at all stages of Senate searches (composition of applicant pool, short list, finalists)

### Outreach for Inclusive Applicant Pools

Stacy et al. (2018) - Practices such as broadening applicant pools through outreach to the UC President's Postdoctoral Fellows were strongly correlated with diversity at successive stages of the faculty search

Sommers (2006) - Heterogeneous juries examined a wider range of information than homogeneous juries, particularly affecting decisions related to defendants by race

Stacy et al. (2018) - Compared to faculty searches where committee composition was less than 40% women, the committees comprised of at least 40% women showed hiring results that included higher percentages of women and candidates who identified from historically underrepresented ethnic or racial minority backgrounds at each search stage

## Search Process Part II - Search Chair and Committee

Several best practices in faculty search processes are applicable when discussing the search chair and committee roles.

- You are strongly encouraged to review the applicant pool characteristics **before** the search closes.
- Recruit reports are generated by selecting the "Diversity" tab to produce a current demographic profile of applicants who have provided this information (most do), which may be compared to the national availability.
- If there is a discrepancy between the applicant pool and national availability, additional actions should be taken to attract applicants **before** the search closes.

## Relevant Best Practices Related to Search Chair and Candidate Reviews

### Composition of Search Committees

Sommers (2006) - Heterogeneous juries examined a wider range of information than homogeneous juries, particularly affecting decisions related to defendants by race

Stacy et al. (2018) - Compared to faculty searches where committee composition was less than 40% women, the committees comprised of at least 40% women showed hiring results that included higher percentages of women and candidates who identified from historically underrepresented ethnic or racial minority backgrounds at each search stage

### Using Diversity Statements and Pre-determined Selection Criteria

Schmalzing et al. (2015) - thematically assessing diversity statements provides specific evidence of and shows variance across distinct diversity dimensions

Brecher et al. (2006) – among the findings, there were significant differences between applicant ratings from structured interviews (same questions asked) than from unstructured interviews, with greater variance across ratings from unstructured interviews

### Mitigating Implicit Bias

Committee members should be aware about the role of biases in their decision making for faculty hires. For example, Steinpreis et al. (1999) found that men and women psychologists who reviewed gender-manipulated CVs more frequently voted to hire candidates who were men rather than those who were women, although the reviewed CVs were identical. Also, findings from Bertrand & Mullainathan (2004) showed that resumes with names believed to represent White candidates received 50% more callbacks for interviews than those interpreted to represent Blacks on the same materials

Regner et al. (2019) - Ongoing examination of bias and its role in decision making is needed during faculty committee recruitment reviews as committees are most likely to act on their implicit gender bias when they do not believe that systemic biases are a problem or need to be addressed

## **Search Process Part II - Review Completed Applications**

Careful consideration of all candidate materials aids the process for deliberation and decision making for short lists and final selections. Best practices to aid in these reviews include:

- Allow sufficient time (15-minute minimum) to read each application and to review candidate materials
- Review applicants' statements on previous and/or potential contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion

## **Search Process Part II - Developing a Short List**

As faculty search committee members select candidates for campus interviews, they are asked to consider the following best practices:

- Review position criteria
- Use a matrix of criteria, including research, teaching and diversity statement
- Discuss proposed long short-list with the department faculty
- In Recruit, provide rationale for proposed short-list, along the lines of research, teaching, service and diversity. In the end, you will have to provide rationale for (non)selection for all applicants in the pool
- If there exist discrepancies between your applicant pool and national availability, you need to upload
- a memo explaining this.
- The chair can upload the memo in the documentation section of the recruitment window. This section is found under the search info tab in the main recruitment window.
- Equity advisor is part of review approvals

## **Search Process Part III - Selection and Hiring**

Returning to the job position criteria and the agreed review items from the research, teaching and diversity statements are necessary steps to ensure that final decisions are were achieved through careful and fair consideration.

## Relevant Best Practices for Candidate Selection

As committees and faculty colleagues complete their reviews and discussions, emphasis on creating fair processes for candidate appraisals are informed by research to help reduce implicit biases and to promote attention to all candidate materials.

### Optimal Time and Attention to Candidate Materials

Martell (1991) - Reviewers who faced time pressures and attention demands when focusing on candidate materials rated men more favorably than women, and these differences disappeared when reviewers allocated full attention and sufficient time to candidate information.

### Fair Review Practices

Blacksmith et al. (2016) – Metanalyses of 13 unique samples showed that interview ratings and applicant responses tended to be lower during technology-mediated interviews. Authors cautioned about mixing the mode of interviews across applicants in order to provide fair opportunity to all candidates

Johnson et al. (2016) – the chances of hiring one woman were increased with at least two women in the finalist pool and the chances for hiring one individual identifying from a minoritized group were increased with at least two candidates from a minoritized group in the finalist pool

Johnson & Kirk (2020) – Proposal review processes where both reviewers and faculty reviewed were anonymous resulted in fairer evaluations for women (no significance differences in ratings for men and women when dual-anonymization was practiced compared to significant variances when the process was not used)

Kaplan et al. (2008) - A research-based rubric supported assessment and enhanced quality of faculty and graduate student teaching statements

Uhlmann & Cohen (2007) - Reviewers with self-beliefs about their objectivity made biased, gender-based assessments of job applicants and this disadvantaged women applicants.



## Guidance for Virtual Interviews

Technology is a useful tool to facilitate recruitments and the following practices are recommended to support fair access and engagement of candidates during the search process.

- Using multi-hour interview scheduling that avoid what may be common meal/pick up times for childcare
- Providing a standard tip sheet and opportunity for practice time in advance of scheduled interviews to ensure accessibility
- Providing standard interview confirmations that include date, time and duration of interview, interviewer/participant names and titles
- Offering resources to showcase UCI – independent meeting with equity advisor, virtual campus tour, information about UCI-wide policies related to Stop-the-Clock and other relevant practices
- Creating a separate, dedicated meeting for debriefing on candidates (avoiding re-use of any candidate's virtual interview line for such conversations)

## Best Practices for Interactions with Candidates

The following best practices for use in virtual interviews were provided by Professor Aimee Edinger, used during her service as an equity advisor for the School of Biological Sciences.

- Avoid questions prohibited by federal law
- It is acceptable to talk about own experiences and use of UCI resources to invite candidate questions, if the candidate decides to query (e.g., childcare facilities)
- Salary, teaching load, space, office budget and startup funding, or initiation of the UCI Career Partners Program are the responsibilities of the chair and/or dean. Please direct such questions to these contacts
- Be consistent. Treat all candidates that visit our campus similarly and impart consistent information
- Record candidate information in all the categories for evaluation rather than noting only “highlights”
- Avoid casually discussing job applicants with colleagues
- Underscore the campus commitment to work-life balance and a healthy faculty culture. Introduce the UCI community and explain why this is an outstanding environment in which to conduct high-impact, cutting edge, interdisciplinary research, and evidence-based pedagogy.

## Additional Resources

There are several additional resources to enhance equity and inclusion in the faculty search process, and suggestions are shared below with additional information at: <https://inclusion.uci.edu/recruitment-resources/>

**Gender Bias Calculator** - Offered at the Lehigh University website. May be used to identify the instances of gender bias occurring in text samples such as letters of recommendation: <https://www.tomforth.co.uk/genderbias/>

**Inclusive Excellence Activity Statement** (video) - Overview of the aims and suggestions for content: <https://inclusion.uci.edu/recruitment-resources/>

**Required Text for Senate Faculty Recruitment Ads** - text provided by the UCI Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity: <https://inclusion.uci.edu/recruitment-resources/>

**Steps in Recruitment Process and Diversity Considerations** - an overview of the Academic Personnel steps for Senate searches and opportunities for considerations of equity and inclusion for diverse faculty recruitments: <https://inclusion.uci.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Search-Steps-for-Faculty.pdf>

**University of California (UC) Guidelines for Addressing Race and Gender Equity in Academic Programs in Compliance with Proposition 209** - overviews policies and provides examples of opportunities for advancing inclusive excellence in campus climate, student and faculty programs, and other supports: <https://diversity.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/documents/prop-209-guidelines-ogc-full.pdf>

**UC Berkeley Rubric to Assess Candidate Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion** - <https://ofew.berkeley.edu/recruitment/contributions-diversity/rubric-assessing-candidate-contributions-diversity-equity>

**UCI Academic Personnel Guidance for the Inclusive Excellence Activities Statement** - provides tips for writing about and assessing contributions to inclusive excellence: <https://ap.uci.edu/faculty/guidance/ieactivities> and <https://ap.uci.edu/faculty/guidance/iecontributions/>

## References

- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Papers*. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w9873>.
- Blacksmith, N., Willford, J.C., Behrend, T.S. (2016). Technology in the employment interview: A meta-analysis and future research agenda. *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*, 2(1), 12-20. <http://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/pad/>
- Brecher, E., Bragger, J., & Kutcher, E. (2006). The structured interview: Reducing biases toward job applicants with physical disabilities. *Employment Responsibility Rights Journal*, 18, 155-170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-006-9014-y>
- Flory, J.A., Leibbrandt, A., Rott, C., & Stoddard, O. (2021). Increasing workplace diversity: Evidence from a recruiting experiment at a Fortune 500 company. *Journal of Human Resources*, 56, 73-92. <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.56.1.0518-9489Rl>.
- Johnson, S., Hekman, D., & Chan, E. (2016). If there's only one woman in your candidate pool, there's statistically no chance she'll be hired. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2016/04/if-theres-only-one-woman-in-your-candidate-pool-the-res-statistically-no-chance-she-shell-be-hired>.
- Johnson, S.K., & Kirk, J.F. (2020). Dual-anonymization yields promising results for reducing gender bias: A naturalistic field experiment of applications for Hubble Space Telescope time. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 132. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1538-3873/ab6ce0>.
- Kaplan, M., Meizlish, D.S., O'Neal, C., & Wright, M.C. (2008). A research-based rubric for developing statements of teaching philosophy. *To Improve the Academy*, 26(1), 242-262.
- Martell, R.F. (1991). Sex bias at work: The effects of attentional and memory demands on performance ratings of men and women. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21(23), 1939-1960. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1991.tb00515.x>.
- Regner, I., Thinus-Blanc, C., Netter, A., Schmader, T., & Huguet, P. (2019). Committees with implicit biases promote fewer women when they do not believe gender bias exists. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3, 1171-1179. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0686-3>.
- Sommers, S.R. (2006). On racial diversity and group decision making: Identifying multiple effects of racial composition on jury deliberations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 597-612. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.4.597>.
- Stacy, A., Goulden, M., Frasch, K., & Broughton, J., (2018). *Searching for a diverse faculty: Data-driven recommendations*. University of California, Berkeley. [https://ofew.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/searching\\_for\\_a\\_diverse\\_faculty\\_data-driven\\_recommendations.pdf](https://ofew.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/searching_for_a_diverse_faculty_data-driven_recommendations.pdf).
- Steinpreis, R.E., Anders, K., & Ritzke, D., (1999). The impact of gender on the review of curricula vitae of job applicants and tenure candidates: A national empirical study. *Sex Roles*, 41(7/8), 509-528. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1018839203698>.
- Uhlmann, E.L., & Cohen, G.L. (2007). "I think it, therefore it's true": Effects of self-perceived objectivity on hiring discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 104, 207-223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2007.07.001>.