

# For Faculty Search Committees: Improving Female and Underrepresented Minority Recruitment

Last revision: April 2008



# Purpose of This Document

- Highlight and summarize procedures that minimize gender biases in a faculty search
  - Research indicates that everyone (regardless of race or gender) may perceive and treat people differently, based on numerous factors (their school attended, academic advisor, gender, race, social status, hobbies, etc.)
  - Biases are non-conscious (as opposed to outright discrimination)
- Procedures also useful for underrepresented minority (URM) candidates
- Increase the (short-term and long-term) success rate for recruiting excellent faculty
  - Information is geared towards junior-level searches
- Detailed information provided in **Supplement**



## Advice for minimizing the influence of bias and assumptions:

- **Strive to increase the representation of women and minorities in your applicant pool.**  
Research shows that gender assumptions are more likely to negatively influence evaluation of women when they represent a small proportion (less than 25%) of the pool of candidates (Heilman).
- **Learn about and discuss research on biases and assumptions and consciously strive to minimize their influence on your evaluation.**  
Experimental studies show that greater awareness of discrepancies between the ideals of impartiality and actual performance, together with strong internal motivations to respond without prejudice, effectively reduces prejudicial behavior (Devine et al.).

- **Develop evaluation criteria prior to evaluating candidates and apply them consistently to all applicants.**  
Research shows that different standards may be used to evaluate male and female applicants and that when criteria are not clearly articulated before reviewing candidates evaluators may shift or emphasize criteria that favor candidates from well-represented demographic groups (Biernat and Fuegen; Uhlmann and Cohen).
- **Spend sufficient time (at least 20 minutes) evaluating each applicant.**  
Evaluators who were busy, distracted by other tasks, and under time pressure gave women lower ratings than men for the same written evaluation of job performance. Sex bias decreased when they were able to give all their time and attention to their judgments, which rarely occurs in actual work settings (Martell).
- **Evaluate each candidate's entire application; don't depend too heavily on only one element such as the letters of recommendation, or the prestige of the degree-granting institution or post-doctoral program.**  
Recall the study showing significant patterns of difference in letters of recommendation for male and female applicants (Trix and Psenka).

- **Be able to defend every decision for eliminating or advancing a candidate.**

Research shows that holding evaluators to high standards of accountability for the fairness of their evaluation reduces the influence of bias and assumptions (Foschi).

- **Periodically evaluate your judgments, determine whether qualified women and underrepresented minorities are included in your pool, and consider whether evaluation biases and assumptions are influencing your decisions by asking yourself the following questions:**

- ❑ Are women and minority candidates subject to different expectations in areas such as numbers of publications, name recognition, or personal acquaintance with a committee member? (*Recall the example of the Swedish Medical Research Council.*)
- ❑ Are candidates from institutions other than the major research universities that have trained most of our faculty being undervalued? (*Qualified candidates from institutions such as historically black universities,\* four-year colleges, government, or industry, might offer innovative, diverse, and valuable perspectives on research and teaching.*)

\*more broadly, minority-serving universities

- ❑ Have the accomplishments, ideas, and findings of women or minority candidates been undervalued or unfairly attributed to a research director or collaborators despite contrary evidence in publications or letters of reference? (*Recall the biases seen in evaluations of written descriptions of job performance.*)
- ❑ Is the ability of women or minorities to run a research group, raise funds, and supervise students and staff of different gender or ethnicity being underestimated? (*Recall social assumptions about leadership abilities.*)
- ❑ Are assumptions about possible family responsibilities and their effect on a candidate's career path negatively influencing evaluation of a candidate's merit, despite evidence of productivity? (*Recall studies of the influence of generalizations on evaluation.*)
- ❑ Are negative assumptions about whether women or minority candidates will "fit in" to the existing environment influencing evaluation? (*Recall students' choice of counselor.*)

# [ Search Authorization Timeline ]

- Spring: Dean works with chairs for hiring targets
- Early June: Dean submits hiring plan to Provost
- June and July: Provost considers requests
- August: Provost meets with each Dean
- September: Provost gives verbal agreement to hire
- Late September – Early October: Provost gives written (official) notice to hire

# Recruiting Process Timeline

	Jun-Aug	Sept-Nov	Nov-Jan	Dec-Feb	Feb-Apr	Feb-Apr	All year
<b>Stage #</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<b>Recruiting Process Action</b>	Decide on search criteria	Evaluate applicant packages	Select the short-listed candidates	Interview	Select the top candidate(s)	Close the deal	<i>Develop the candidate pool</i>
<b>Equity &amp; Diversity Process Enhancement Action</b>	Actively seek out female and minority candidates	Be aware of non-conscious biases in package and rec. letters	Invite at least one qualified female and minority candidate	Present the WorkLife brochure	Be aware of possible gender difference in commun. style	Work on non-professional aspects of offer package	<i>Go beyond what our peer institutions are doing</i>

Search Ad

Invitation

# [ Specific Action Items ]

## Pre-advertisement (Stage 1)

- Decide if search will be broad or narrow
- Seek out applications from female/URM candidates

## Evaluating all the applications (Stage 2)

- Decide on criteria before evaluating applications
- Be aware of biases in rec. letters, applic. packages
- “Grade” all applications for initial screen

## Choosing candidates for campus visit (Stage 3)

- Use detailed rating system to select candidates
- Don't rank-order the candidate pool
- Arrange for interviews to occur in short time-frame

# Specific Action Items

## During each campus visit (Stage 4)

- Designate a faculty member as his/her host
- Offer meetings with folks with similar background
- Don't ask illegal questions; use Work/Life brochure
- Ask some “standardized” questions during meetings

## After each campus visit – Evaluating all finalists (Stage 5)

- Use a rating system to gauge candidates's potential
- Be aware of any biases during your interactions

## Informing the top choice (Stage 6)

- Ask if someone else will help in decision-making
- Work on non-professional aspects of package



# [ Recruiting Committee ]

Chair: Michael Wong CHBE mswong@rice.edu  
 Co-Chair: Cecilia Clementi CHEM cecilia@rice.edu

Pedro Alvarez	CEE	alvarez@rice.edu
Jung Hae Suh	BIOE	jsuh@rice.edu
Cynthia Johnson	CEEE	cjj1983@rice.edu
Barry Dunning	P&A	fbd@rice.edu
Marcie O'Malley	MEMS	omalley@rice.edu
Giovanni Fossati	P&A	gfossati@rice.edu
Mary Ellen Lane	BCB	melane@rice.edu
Joe Warren	CS	jwarren@rice.edu



Jan Rinehart, Executive Director Jan.rinehart@rice.edu  
 Kisha McRae-Kennedy, Coordinator knm2@rice.edu