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Rating Sheet 1, for Pre-screening of All Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Present Position/Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Grade Definition**
A – Definitely worthy of consideration/discussion  
B – Possibly worthy of consideration/discussion  
C – Do not consider further

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** This template is used first. All committee members read, make comments, and grade applicants with a grade of A, B, or C.

This is a template; adapt for your Department’s use.
## Rating Sheet 2, for Detailed Review of Top Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Committee Members →</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence/Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact well here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work here independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to contribute to diverse work environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score by each Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter score for each category from 0 to 5, with 5 being the best. Decimal scores are ok.

This is a template; adapt for your Department’s use.
Rating Sheet 3, for Detailed Review of Interviewees

The proposed questions are designed for junior faculty candidates.

Candidate’s Name:
Please indicate which of the following are true for you (check all that apply):
• Read candidate’s CV
• Met with candidate
• Read candidate’s scholarship
• Attended lunch or dinner with candidate
• Read candidate’s letters of recommendation
• Other (please explain):
• Attended candidate’s job talk

Please comment on the candidates scholarship as reflected in the job talk:
Please comment on the candidates teaching ability as reflected in the job talk:
Other comments:
Please rate the junior-level candidate on each of the following | Excellent | Good | Neutral | Fair | Poor | Unable to evaluate
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Potential for scholarly impact |
Potential for research productivity |
Potential for research funding |
Potential for intra-department and interdisciplinary collaborations |
Fit with the department’s priorities |
Ability to make positive contribution to department climate |
Potential to attract and supervise graduate students |
Potential to teach and supervise undergraduates |
Potential to be a conscientious university community member |

This is a template; adapt for your Department’s use
## Legal/Illegal Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>OK Questions</th>
<th>Forbidden Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>May ask whether at least 18 years of age.</td>
<td>Inquiry that suggests preference for younger person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Whether can be employed at time of appointment with valid citizenship/visa status</td>
<td>Whether applicant is a citizen (cannot request materials before employment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Whether applicant can perform the essential functions of the position, with or without reasonable accommodation</td>
<td>Inquiry about nature, severity or extent of disability or whether applicant requires reasonable accommodation, any inquiry not job-related or consistent with business necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Whether applicant can meet specified work schedules or has activities, commitments or responsibilities that may prevent meeting work attendance requirements</td>
<td>Inquiry concerning spouse, spouse’s employment or salary, children, childcare arrangements, or dependents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any inquiry about the applicant’s marital status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>OK Questions</td>
<td>Forbidden Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>Inquiry into ability to read/write/speak foreign language if job requirement</td>
<td>Any other inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy/medical issue</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any inquiry related to pregnancy, medical history, and related matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or Color</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any inquiry concerning race or color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>Names of relatives currently employed at University</td>
<td>Any other inquiry about marital status, spouse, or spouse’s occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or Creed</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any inquiry in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any inquiry concerning gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any inquiry regarding sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Reviewing Applicants: Research on Bias and Assumptions”
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Reviewing Applicants

Research on Bias and Assumptions
We all like to think that we are objective scholars who judge people solely on their credentials and achievements, but copious research shows that every one of us has a lifetime of experience and cultural history that shapes the review process.

“To evaluate other people more accurately we need to challenge our implicit hypotheses … we need to become explicitly aware of them.”

VIRGINIA VALIAN

The results from controlled research studies demonstrate that people often hold implicit or unconscious assumptions that influence their judgments. Examples range from expectations or assumptions about physical or social characteristics associated with race, gender, and ethnicity to those associated with certain job descriptions, academic institutions, and fields of study.

It is important to note that in most studies examining evaluation and gender, the sex of the evaluator was not significant; both men and women share and apply the same assumptions about gender.

Recognizing biases and other influences not related to the quality of candidates can help reduce their impact on your search and review of candidates.

Examples of common social assumptions or expectations:

• When shown photographs of people of the same height, evaluators overestimated the heights of male subjects and underestimated the heights of female subjects, even though a reference point, such as a doorway, was provided (Biernat et al.).
• When shown photographs of men with similar athletic abilities, evaluators rated the athletic ability of African American men higher than that of white men (Biernat and Manis).
• When asked to choose counselors from among a group of equally competent applicants who were neither exceptionally qualified nor unqualified for the position, students more often chose white candidates than African American candidates, indicating their willingness to give members of the majority group the benefit of the doubt (Dovidio and Gaertner).

These studies show that we often apply generalizations that may or may not be valid to the evaluation of individuals (Bielby and Baron). In the study on height, evaluators applied the statistically accurate generalization that on average men are taller than women to their estimates of the height of individuals who did not necessarily conform to the generalization. If generalizations can lead us to inaccurately evaluate characteristics as objective and easily measured as height, what happens when the qualities we are evaluating are not as objective or as easily measured? What happens when the generalizations are not accurate?

“Even the most well-intentioned person unwittingly allows unconscious thoughts and feelings to influence apparently objective decisions.”

Mahzarin R. Banaji
Examples of assumptions or biases that can influence the evaluation of applications:

- When rating the quality of verbal skills as indicated by vocabulary definitions, evaluators rated the skills lower if they were told an African American provided the definitions than if they were told that a white person provided them (Biernat and Manis).
- Randomly assigning different names to résumés showed that job applicants with “white-sounding names” were more likely to be interviewed for open positions than were equally qualified applicants with “African American-sounding names” (Bertrand and Sendhil).
- When symphony orchestras adopted “blind” auditions by using a screen to conceal candidates’ identities, the hiring of women musicians increased. Blind auditions fostered impartiality by preventing assumptions that women musicians have “smaller techniques” and produce “poorer sound” from influencing evaluation (Goldin and Rouse).
- Research shows that incongruities between perceptions of female gender roles and leadership roles cause evaluators to assume that women will be less competent leaders. When women leaders provide clear evidence of their competence, thus violating traditional gender norms, evaluators perceive them to be less likeable and are less likely to recommend them for hiring or promotion (Eagly and Karau; Ridgeway; Heilman et al.).
Examples of assumptions or biases in academic job-related contexts:

- A study of over 300 recommendation letters for medical faculty hired by a large U.S. medical school found that letters for female applicants differed systematically from those for males. Letters written for women were shorter, provided “minimal assurance” rather than solid recommendation, raised more doubts, portrayed women as students and teachers while portraying men as researchers and professionals, and more frequently mentioned women’s personal lives (Trix and Psenka).

- In a national study, 238 academic psychologists (118 male, 120 female) evaluated a curriculum vitae randomly assigned a male or a female name. Both male and female participants gave the male applicant better evaluations for teaching, research, and service experience and were more likely to hire the male than the female applicant (Steinpreis et al.).

- A study of postdoctoral fellowships awarded by the Medical Research Council of Sweden found that women candidates needed substantially more publications to achieve the same rating as men, unless they personally knew someone on the panel (Wennerås and Wold).

When we assume “that cultural, racial, ethnic, and gender biases are simply nonexistent [in] screening and evaluation processes, there is grave danger that minority and female candidates will be rejected.”

CAROLINE S.V. TURNER
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 under-valued? (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.)
  □ 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.)
REFERENCES:
For full references please see: http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/initiatives/hiring/BrochureReferences.pdf
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Ask for actual brochures from your Department administrator or Lisa Hall (eah2@rice.edu)
Who knew you could have a great career and a great life?

Know more at www.worklife.rice.edu
Jonathan “Joff” Silberg
Assistant Professor — Biochemistry and Cell Biology

Carrie Masiello
Assistant Professor — Earth Science

When Joff and Carrie were looking for career opportunities, they were impressed with the professionalism and administrative support they received from Rice, beginning with the interview process. And Rice was quick to realize the potential that these two scientists — a terrific package deal — could bring to the university.

“When we first started looking for jobs, we were interested in a collegial environment and department functionality, as well as a place to do good science. After looking at many institutions, we were impressed by the funding and breadth of equipment available at Rice. Rice has the range of major scientific equipment that you would find at a university three or four times its size, but unlike many big schools, Rice makes the many pieces of equipment available to all researchers. This was a big deal for us. Once we arrived, we recognized another advantage: Rice has allowed us the opportunity to have both a career and a family. At many places we looked, it was understood that you did not have children before you got tenure. But Rice is a place where you can work hard and still have a family life. We can afford to live within walking distance of work, and we have a high-quality preschool nearby.”
**IT’S A CAMPUS COMMUNITY ...**

Of distinguished colleagues

Whether it’s a spirited debate in the academic halls that produces a published article or a cooperative research project involving faculty members from various disciplines, there is extraordinary discussion and collaboration that happens at Rice University. It’s more than just a few chance encounters — faculty are drawn to Rice because of the culture and feel naturally connected through exceptional backgrounds and accomplishments. And many faculty members live close to campus in housing that is set apart from the bustling city with trees, parks, coffeehouses and boutiques.

Of superior students

Recruited from all over the world, students come to Rice because we are a selective, diverse institution where students can tailor their studies to specific interests. With a student–to–faculty ratio of 5:1 and a typical class size of 15, we get to know our students and form critical and enjoyable lifelong relationships. Our students have had a choice in their college selection, and they choose Rice.

Of on-campus resources

From relaxing at a Shepherd School of Music concert, featuring Chopin’s works, to joining the many enthusiastic fans at one of our sporting events, the Rice campus has a multitude of things to do. In addition, we are enhancing our facilities with several major construction projects designed to improve our recreation, dining, child care and outdoor space.

Of big city advantages

It does not get much better than working right across the street from one of the world’s premier medical communities. The Texas Medical Center boasts the nation’s No. 1 cancer center (M.D. Anderson) and top 10 heart institute (St. Luke’s), as well as many other first-rate hospitals, clinics, research centers and laboratories. In addition to having easy access to the country’s best doctors and specialists, the medical and business community is ripe with opportunities for additional collaborative projects and research.

Houston, the fourth largest city in the United States, is diverse. Our international community speaks more than 90 languages and has 88 consulates. And, everyone can find something to do — Houston offers 75 art galleries, 10,000 theater seats, five major league sports teams and 508 parks, and Galveston’s beaches are only 45 minutes away. In addition to plenty of entertainment options, Houston offers abundant economic opportunity, boasting more Fortune 500 companies than almost any other city. Plus, the city’s two commercial airports are part of one of the largest public airport systems in North America and offer scheduled nonstop domestic and international service to nearly 200 destinations.

For more information about Houston, visit www.rice.edu/houston.

---

**Joseph Campana**

Assistant Professor — English

The livability of Houston and the quality of the institution were what drove Joe to Rice when he began looking for his next career opportunity.

“Rice has all the advantages of a compact, elite university packaged in a great city. It offers me a university with a rich and strong tradition in the humanities, the intense closeness of a liberal arts college and the opportunity to work with graduate students. Rice also provides a flexible schedule, which is important to me. With our great student–to-faculty ratio, no one is overwhelmed with too much work. That presents an ideal set of working conditions which benefits me, as I have a partner in Boston and need to travel. And Houston is Rice’s not-so-secret asset. I enjoy all the arts, especially on campus. Three or four times a week, I can walk to The Shepherd School of Music for great concerts. Rice and Houston provide the total package — an institution you want to work at located in a lively and livable city.”

---

**Faculty Distinctions**

Our faculty, with more than 600 full-time members, is accomplished in all areas of teaching and research. These scholars have been recognized for their work in academia, awarding of patents and many other professional accolades. In addition, our faculty has received the following distinctions:

- Nobel Prize – 2
- Pulitzer Prize – 1
- Fulbright Scholars Program – 6
- Alexander von Humboldt Foundation Recipients – 29
- American Academy of Arts and Sciences Members – 8
- American Philosophical Society Member – 1
- Guggenheim Fellowships – 35
- Institute of Medicine of the National Academies – 2
- National Academy of Engineering – 13
- National Academy of Sciences – 4
- National Humanities Center Fellows – 5
- National Science Foundation Awards/Fellowships – 86
- National Science Foundation/Career Awards – 39
Rice offers an array of family friendly benefits to help support faculty and staff with all of life’s events, from child care resources to elder care support. Our citywide employee discounts, Rice Children’s Center (scheduled to open in 2008) and fitness facilities are available to you and your family. Flexible work arrangements and family leaves, as well as counseling services, provide critical assistance for the inevitable challenges of balancing work and personal life. And, ongoing employee development, tuition reimbursement and tuition for eligible dependents round out "The Advantage of Rice." For more information, visit www.worklife.rice.edu.

Through academic access, performance feedback and funding

Our faculty note that “access to administration” and “the level of senior faculty engagement” are leading sources of personal job satisfaction and that distinguishes Rice from many other academic institutions. Junior faculty comment on the level of respect and support they receive and the opportunity to meet a variety of staff and faculty members from across campus. A supportive climate and collegial community help faculty develop and achieve their professional ambitions. Support also comes from program funding. Over the last two years, Rice received more than $160 million from external sources for research, training and outreach. Easy access, collegial community and administrative support provides faculty members peace of mind on campus, so they feel more at ease when taking time to have a life off campus.

DUAL CAREER SUPPORT

We realize that accepting employment at Rice University often impacts the employment needs of the potential faculty’s spouse or partner and presents relocation challenges common with any move. To help with that transition, Rice has created a support system to assist candidates and families with possible employment opportunities, child care and other needs. For more information, contact Lisa Hall at 713-348-5711 or eah2@rice.edu.

Alexander X. Byrd
Assistant Professor — History

A native Houstonian and 1990 Rice graduate, Alex cast a broad net when looking for teaching opportunities and postgraduate work. With his wife working in secondary education, the Byrds were not tied to any particular area of the country. However, what drew Alex back home and to Rice was the opportunity to engage in major research and collaboration.

“Rice was very clear on research support, and I did not find that everywhere I looked. It was nice to join an institution where I could just concentrate on my work. Rice is a very entrepreneurial place. If you have a good idea, you can find support for it. And the intellectual collaboration across campus is terrific. Rice is supportive in other areas, too, like providing benefits. From the moment I got here, I have never been disappointed with the health and child care benefits Rice offers. The university has not stood still in this area. The best thing that Rice now offers me is back-up child care. It is the single most important thing, day-to-day and week-to-week, having peace of mind that no matter what happens, my children have a great place to be if our regular care breaks down.”

... WHERE YOU CAN HAVE A LIFE

Through benefits to help you balance priorities

Rice offers an array of family friendly benefits to help support faculty and staff with all of life’s events, from child care resources to elder care support.

Our citywide employee discounts, Rice Children’s Center (scheduled to open in 2008) and fitness facilities are available to you and your family.

Flexible work arrangements and family leaves, as well as counseling services, provide critical assistance for the inevitable challenges of balancing work and personal life.

And, ongoing employee development, tuition reimbursement and tuition for eligible dependents round out “The Advantage of Rice.” For more information, visit www.worklife.rice.edu.

Through academic access, performance feedback and funding

Our faculty note that “access to administration” and “the level of senior faculty engagement” are leading sources of personal job satisfaction and that distinguishes Rice from many other academic institutions. Junior faculty comment on the level of respect and support they receive and the opportunity to meet a variety of staff and faculty members from across campus.

A supportive climate and collegial community help faculty develop and achieve their professional ambitions.

Support also comes from program funding. Over the last two years, Rice received more than $160 million from external sources for research, training and outreach.

Easy access, collegial community and administrative support provides faculty members peace of mind on campus, so they feel more at ease when taking time to have a life off campus.

Who knew Houston was so cool? 5 professional sports teams
Bridget K. Gorman  
Associate Professor — Sociology  
Undergraduate Adviser  
Resident Associate  

After spending her formative years in the North, Bridget warmed up to the idea of Southern living while developing her career. She was looking for an institution with a small student body and a lot of character. After seeing ads for Rice and speaking with friends who were familiar with the university’s reputation, Bridget sent in an application, visited campus and fell in love.

“Rice is more than just a place to teach. Rice is different. It is not like the other schools I looked at. Because of the friendly culture, I know a lot of people, at all levels and from all over the university. The small size feels so intimate. I have been blown away by the quality of the undergraduates. As a resident associate, I live with students and count them as my friends. And on campus, it is nice to have free recreation options, and I love being able to play tennis outside year-round.”

Behnaam Aazhang  
Chair of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
J.S. Abercrombie Professor  

Behnaam was attracted to Rice because of its reputation and the overall quality of the institution, faculty and students. Because of the continued opportunities to do work of his choosing and be judged independently for his research and teaching, Behnaam remains — 22 years later — more than satisfied with the university.

“I’ve been able to shape the future, even as a young assistant professor, of this place, and to add in my own style. Rice allows me to explore collaborations outside the institution and around the world. The friendly, all-inclusive atmosphere here is hard to beat. The intellectual capital is exceptional, and the quality of students Rice attracts is outstanding. From a personal standpoint, Rice gives me freedom and really understands family commitments. And campus is a great place to come for family outings. My children love the sporting events, and they can safely explore campus.”
A self-described “city guy,” Mike was looking for a career opportunity in a metropolitan area but with a small school. After spending time on both coasts at Caltech and MIT, he did not know much about Houston before making a trip to interview at Rice. After making the commitment to move, he stumbled upon Chinatown located on the city’s west side. Mike says it was a minor thing, but it helped him feel at home. He and his wife enjoy the cultural diversity in Houston and the amenities of big-city life, including the museums, musical performances and sporting events.

“My trips to Houston really opened my eyes, not only to what a great city it is, but also to what a great opportunity I could have at Rice. I knew about the high-quality chemical engineering department and that Rice was at the epicenter of nanotechnology research. What I did not realize was that the opportunities for collaboration in Houston are so vast. The medical community is right across the street, where my wife just started her ob-gyn medical practice, and the resources are so vast. The medical community is right across the street, where my wife just started her ob-gyn medical practice, and the resources that the oil companies bring to the table are unbeatable. At the same time, the city acts small — if you do something interesting in research, the technology community in Houston finds out and people feel comfortable coming to campus to talk to you about it. That exposure has led to tangible projects for me. The research, resources and connections you can make here really go above and beyond my expectations.”

WorkLife on the Web
For more comprehensive information, visit the WorkLife Web site at www.worklife.rice.edu, which provides important resources to help you achieve your goals at work and at home.

Who Knew Houston was so cool? Home of NASA Johnson Space Center
A VISION FOR RICE UNIVERSITY

As a leading research university with a distinctive commitment to undergraduate education, Rice University aspires to pathbreaking research, unsurpassed teaching and contributions to the betterment of our world. It seeks to fulfill this mission by cultivating a diverse community of learning and discovery that produces leaders across the spectrum of human endeavor.

The university must take the following steps in furtherance of this mission:

- We must visibly and substantially increase our commitment to our research mission and raise our research and scholarship profile.

- We must provide a holistic undergraduate experience that equips our students with the knowledge, the skills and the values to make a distinctive impact in the world.

- We must strengthen our graduate and postdoctoral programs to attract and recruit high-caliber students and young researchers.

- We must aggressively foster collaborative relationships with other institutions to leverage our resources.

- We must invest in a select number of interdisciplinary endeavors that will enable us to leverage our own strengths as well as the strengths of potential collaborators.

- We must continue to invest in our professional schools in architecture, management and music, as well as the James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, and seek ways to integrate their success into the broader university.

- We must increase the size of the university to realize more fully our ambition as an institution of national and international distinction that attracts the very best students and researchers from around the globe.

- We must become an international university, with a more significant orientation toward Asia and Latin America than now characterizes our commitments.

- We must provide the spaces and facilities that will cultivate greater dynamism and vibrancy on the campus and foster our sense of community.

- We must fully engage with the city of Houston — learning from it and contributing to it — as a successful partnership with our home city is an essential part of our future.

A Vision for Rice University — Emerging from President David W. Leebron’s Call to Conversation. The Rice University Board of Trustees unanimously endorsed the tenets of this vision at its December 2005 meeting. Additional information about Rice’s Vision for the Second Century is available at www.rice.edu/v2c.
Detailed Information for each Stage

- Each “Specific Action Item” listed in Recruitment document is identified in bold type
Stage 1. Deciding on Search Criteria

- **Decide if search will be broad or narrow**
  - Broad search for “best athlete”
  - Narrow search for best person in a specific field

- **Put together the Search Committee**
  - At least 5 members
  - 1 chair, 1 co-chair (1 of the chairs should be in the research area being looked for)
  - Minimum of 2 in research area, up to 5
  - Include non-department members for interdisciplinary research areas
  - Diversify committee by race, gender, culture, research, teaching, other perspectives, etc.
  - 1 member designated as “faculty search liaison” (who works with the Dean’s/Provost’s office on equity/diversity issues)
Stage 1. Deciding on Search Criteria (continued)

- Decide what will be required in the application package:
  - CV
  - letters of recommendation, or names of recommendation letter writers
  - Research statement
  - Teaching statement

- Are interdisciplinary research and new fields being considered?

- Has the ad been written as broadly as possible?

- Write and place ad in appropriate disciplinary journals
  - Place on Department web site
Stage 1. Deciding on Search Criteria (continued)

- **Seek out applications from female/URM candidates**
  - Ask colleagues for recommendations
  - Ask Rice PhD and postdocs for names of their friends and colleagues
  - Send individual letters or make phone calls asking them to apply
  - Search Fellowship holders such as NSF, NIH, GEM, AGEP, IGERT, Sloan, etc.
  - Search recruited schools for postdocs/PhDs

- Take advantage of ADVANCE Database and ADVANCE “Negotiating the Ideal Faculty Position” Workshop in the Fall

- Has the ad been placed in multiple female- and minority-focused listserves and organizations?

- Have we asked our female/URM postdocs/PhD students for their friends?
Stage 1. Deciding on Search Criteria (continued)

- “Active” search (go after candidates) is more effective than “passive” search (let candidates come to you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption: We are good; the good ones will apply</td>
<td>Assumption: the best, particularly women/minorities, are highly competitive, must be sought out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Place ad in technical journal</td>
<td>• Search recruited schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wait</td>
<td>• Search fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open envelopes</td>
<td>• Send personal email/letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ask your colleagues</td>
<td>• Ask your PhD/postdocs for referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Place ad on listserves</td>
<td>• Send personal email/letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pay for ad on diversity sites</td>
<td>• Call people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attend PhD/postdocs talks at national conference</td>
<td>• Identify PhD/postdoc early and “court”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ask your PhD/postdocs for referrals</td>
<td>• Call people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Send personal email/letter</td>
<td>• Ask your PhD/postdocs for referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Call people</td>
<td>• Ask your PhD/postdocs for referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invite PhD/postdoc to campus for sem</td>
<td>• Call colleagues at HSI, MSI, HBCU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 2. Evaluating Applications

- Search Committee sets a timeline and establishes a process

- **Decide on criteria before evaluating applications**
  - Needs to be discussed before anyone reviews the applicant pool, so criteria won’t “float” to any particular applicant

- When will the committee meet to determine campus interviewees?
- How many will come to interview?
- When will the on-campus interviews occur?
Stage 2. Evaluating Applications (continued)

- Will the entire committee read every application package and rate?
  - Will there be pre-review of applications and if so, who will preview applications?

- “Grade” all applications for initial screen
  - Use a rating system for reviewing all applications
  - “Rating Sheet 1, for Pre-screening of All Applications” (sample attached)

- Avoid ranking

- How will the committee weight the diversity of a candidate if two are equal? How will the committee measure “total impact” of hiring a non-majority faculty member?
Stage 2. Evaluating Applications (continued)

- Be aware of biases in recommendation letters & application packages
  - Did we minimize the influence of bias and assumptions during review of applications?
  - Be cognizant of *letter writer biases* (did they over rate men and under rate women?)
  - Be cognizant of *letter reader biases* (did you over rate men and under rate women?)
  - Look at the candidates work history, did we weigh “actual work” for women and weigh “potential” for men?
- Don’t depend too heavily on only one element of application
Stage 3. Selecting the Pool of Invitees

- **Use detailed rating system to select candidates**
  - Provides objectivity
  - “Rating Sheet 2, for Detailed Review of Top Applications” (sample attached)

- Invite top candidates for an on-campus interview

- **Don’t rank-order the candidate pool**

- **Arrange for interviews to occur in short time-frame**
  - Even have two interviews per week
  - Provides for fresher comparison of candidates, and more rapid response to an offer
Stage 3. Selecting the Pool of Invitees (continued)

- Do not assume women and ethnic minorities cannot be moved

- Send pre-campus visit information
  - Work/Life brochure, Houston info, cost of living
  - Rice info, Dept info
  - Schedule
  - Show diversity & culture
  - Appropriate Rice Institutes: EESI, Smalley Institute
Stage 3. Selecting the Pool of Invitees (continued)

- Also provide info on faculty support programs, like:
  - New Faculty Orientation
  - Departmental mentors
  - Office of Sponsored Research, Office of Technology Transfer
  - Primary Caregiver Leave Policy
  - Tenure Clock Extension Policy
  - Other Types of Leaves Available (Medical, Family, etc.)?
  - Copy of Rice Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

- Faculty Search web site
Stage 4. Interview

- Designate a faculty member as his/her host
  - For smooth, trouble-free visit
  - To help candidate with any special requests
- Pick up from airport
  - By faculty member (Nice touch!)
  - Otherwise, have limo service pick him/her up
- Arrange pre-interview dinner with strong and enthusiastic representatives of Department
- First person (s)he meets is Department Chair that morning
  - To talk about “big-picture” and opportunities at Rice, in the Department
Stage 4. Interview (continued)

- Remove people who might reflect poorly on Dept. or Rice from the interview schedule
  - Those who are not positive about Rice/Houston
  - Those who might ask inappropriate/improper questions
- Interview schedule should include…
  - Department faculty
  - Graduate students, post-docs
  - Undergraduates (doing research), if possible
  - Non-Departmental faculty members
- Offer meetings with folks with similar background
Stage 4. Interview (continued)

- Ensure good turnout at their Dept. seminar and post-seminar reception
  - Encourage grad students to ask lots of (good) questions (it would speak to high quality of grad students)
- Be sure to have the candidate give a “chalk talk” or research/teaching plan talk

- **Use Work/Life brochure**
  - As a way for candidate to ask questions or seek information if candidate wishes
  - Have it in convenient view during one-on-one meeting
Stage 4. Interview (continued)

- Don’t ask illegal questions
- Ask some “standardized” questions during meetings
  - Similar questions allow some standardization among faculty when comparing notes
  - Candidates invariably give slightly different answers each time
  - Don’t have all faculty members ask the same questions
  - Decide on which faculty will ask what questions
Stage 4. Interview (continued)

- Examples of “standardized” questions:
  - “How will you be different from your advisor(s)?”
  - “What are the future opportunities for your research field?”
  - “What do you want to be recognized for?”
  - “How will your research fit into Rice?”

- Candidates interested in the details of work/life issues should be placed in contact with Lisa Hall (eah2@rice.edu)
Stage 5. Selection of Top Candidate

- **Use a rating system to gauge candidate’s potential**
  - “Rating Sheet 3, for Detailed Review of Interviewees” (sample attached)
  - Provides internal consistency for each evaluator’s definition of “Excellent,” “Good,” “Poor,” etc.

- **Be aware of any biases during your interactions**
Stage 5. Selection of Top Candidate (continued)

- Search committee chair writes thank-you notes immediately after each candidate, for all candidates
- Other faculty should do the same
  - Nice touch, especially for excellent candidates

- Search committee decides on #1 and #2
  - Presents selections to rest of faculty

- Leave the option open for “opportunity” hires
  - Communicate with the Dean
Stage 6. Closing the Deal

- Inform #1 and #2 choices of their status
  - Work with #1 on offer package
- Invite #1 choice for second visit, if desired
  - Do the hard sell on Rice and Houston
  - Second visit is 2 days
  - Offer them a car or driver
  - Offer to show homes, schools, etc. with a realtor
- Ask if someone else will help in decision-making
  - Could be family member/spouse/fiance(e)/partner/significant other
  - Invite them also
Stage 6. Closing the Deal (continued)

- Department chair works on professional and non-professional aspects of package
  - Ask for help with partner placement from Dean, Provost, Partner Placement staff, etc.
  - Lisa Hall can help (eah2@rice.edu)
- For the second visit,
  - Have informal dinner at faculty member’s house with assistant professors (Chair’s house suggested)
  - Set up appointments with other non-Dept. faculty
- Before the candidate leaves, (s)he should have know the details of offer
Stage 6. Closing the Deal (continued)

- Stay engaged with candidates

- Give a deadline (14-day) to accept
  - Keep up with the deadlines you gave them for decisions

- Search committee will note what worked and not worked, and inform the Dean via the “faculty search liaison”

- Write rejection letters

- Have an assistant professor be in touch with candidate, for miscellaneous questions

- Remind that Rice is working hard on work/life issues for Rice faculty
Stage 6. Closing the Deal (continued)

Don’t overdo the work/life balance sell:
- From a survey of attendees (who are potential female faculty candidates) of ADVANCE’s “Negotiating the Ideal Faculty Position” Workshop (Oct. 12-15, 2007):

Which workshop sessions did you find most useful to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is a search committee looking for?</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to stand out in the interview</td>
<td>66.07%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding the right institutional fit for you</td>
<td>30.36%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How and when to negotiate a good start up package</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to obtain funding</td>
<td>41.07%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching your first course</td>
<td>48.21%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building your lab - Getting the Most From a Mentor</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the tenure process</td>
<td>69.64%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing your life</td>
<td>26.79%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>