FACULTY SEARCH ROADMAP:
DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION CHECKLIST AND RESOURCES

The roadmap below shows points when the search committee should consider reviewing the guidance to ensure that the best practices for attracting and retaining a diverse pool of candidates are used. We encourage department chairs to include the committee and the diversity representative early (for example, before search materials go out).
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Position Advertisement

Crafting advertisement language
☐ Have you defined the position in the widest terms possible that are still consistent with your department/center needs? Narrowly defined position descriptors may unintentionally exclude candidates of diverse backgrounds if subfields have low representation.

☐ Have you included language on your department/center’s commitment to diversity? For example, include diversity statements, initiatives, and/or relate the position to diversity aspects of work. Use gender diverse pronouns including for example gender neutral pronouns in search language (e.g., they, them, theirs). This may make the position more attractive to candidates. Examples, that can be adapted, include:

“Brown University is especially interested in qualified candidates who can contribute, through their research, teaching, and/or service, to the diversity and excellence of the academic community.”

“Brown University [and/or school/college/ department] seeks to recruit and retain a diverse workforce as a reflection of our commitment to serve the diverse people of Rhode Island, to maintain the excellence of the University, and to offer our students richly varied disciplines, perspectives, and ways of knowing and learning.”

“The University is committed to fostering and maintaining a diverse work culture that respects the rights and dignity of each individual, without regard to race, color, national origin, ancestry, religious creed, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, gender expression, height, weight, marital status, disability, medical condition, age, or veteran status. The University is supportive of the needs of dual career couples.”

Utilize School and University Resources
☐ Are there well-qualified candidates for your position within your unit?

☐ Have the School of Public Health Dean of Faculty Affairs and Dean of Diversity and Inclusion provided feedback on the language in your advertisement?

☐ Has the Institutional Office of Equity and Inclusion provided feedback? Specific feedback can be elicited on language to attract diverse candidates, places to advertise, and tailored networks/word of mouth to use specific to the position.

Diversity Representative/Committee Chair
☐ Has the Committee Chair and Diversity Representative adequately worked together to review whether the language of the announcement is attractive to diverse candidates?
Search Plan

Posting Advertisement

Are we utilizing active and targeted recruitment strategies?

In addition to posting the advertisement in typical venues, also consider the following strategies:

☐ In the lead-up to hiring, have you considered using a unit or lecture or seminar series as an early way to explore possible targets of opportunity for future recruitment? For example, the Leadership Alliance Program has funds to bring diverse scholars to speaking opportunities to Brown.

☐ Are we fully using personal contacts made at professional conferences?

☐ Have we asked faculty to help identify diverse and excellent candidates and had them personally invite diverse candidates to apply?

☐ Have we searched for suitable faculty at other institutions and directly sent them the job advertisement?

☐ Have we placed announcements using electronic job-posting services, websites, listservs, journals, and publications targeting diverse groups such as minority and women’s caucuses or professional networks in your discipline? Consider developing a department/center specific database tailored to your discipline for future use. Examples include:
  - American Association for University Women
  - American Indian Science & Engineering Society maintains a job listings page (and a resume database available to Career Fair exhibitors). aises.org
  - American Medical Women’s Association
  - Association of Indian Physicians
  - Association for Women in Science - awis.org
  - Chronicle of Higher Education
  - FASEB/Minority Access to Research Careers (MARC) Program
  - IMDiversity.com - is dedicated to providing career and self-development information to all minorities, specifically African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans and women. It maintains a large database of available jobs, candidate resumes and information on workplace diversity. imdiversity.com
  - nemnet.com - Nemnet is a national minority recruitment firm committed to helping schools and organizations in the identification and recruitment of minority candidates. Since 1994 it has worked with over 200 schools, colleges and universities and organizations. It posts academic jobs on its website and gathers vitas from students and professionals of color.
  - HBCU Connect.com Career Center - is a job posting and recruitment site specifically for students and alumni of historically black colleges and universities.
  - Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Caucus of Public Health Professionals at the American Public Health Association - http://aphalgbt.org/
  - MinorityPostdoc.org - online portal on the minority postdoctoral experience especially in the science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) disciplines.

DATA CONSIDERATIONS: Track “yield” from each venue to see if advertisement investments are worthwhile.

In all targeted recruitment efforts, emphasize scholarship, qualifications, and potential academic role in the department (emphasis should be on excellence rather than diversity characteristics).
Brown University School of Public Health, 2/15/2019

- National Council of Asian and Pacific Islander Physicians
- National Trans Health Summit (run by Center of Excellence in Trans Health at UCSF) (http://transhealth.ucsf.edu/trans?page=ev-00-00)
- TGI Network – http://www.tginetwork.org/what-is-tgi
- The Minority and Women Doctoral Directory (apps.cic.net/CICDirectory): A registry which maintains up-to-date information on employment candidates who have recently received, or are soon to receive, a Doctoral or Master’s degree in their respective field from one of approximately two hundred major research universities in the United States. The current edition of the directory lists approximately 4,500 Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian American, and women graduate students in nearly 80 fields in the sciences, engineering, the social sciences and the humanities. Directories are available for purchase from info@mwdd.com
- Trans Academics (google group) and Trans PhD network (Facebook group) – note that these are closed groups, primarily for academics who are themselves trans, so you might have to start by building relationships with scholars in those groups
- TPATH - Transgender Professional Association for Transgender Health (http://tpathealth.org/)
- WPATH - World Professional Association for Transgender Health, and the WPATH and USPATH conferences (https://www.wpath.org/education/upcoming-conferences)
- Pathways to Science Portal sponsored by the NSF
- Philadelphia Trans Wellness Conference (to meet community-based researchers and providers)
- Sexual and Gender Minority Research Office – https://dpcpsi.nih.gov/sgmro
- Society for the Advancement of Chicanos and Native Americans in Science

Utilize School and University Resources

- Have we reached out to existing partners/leaders at institutions which Brown is connected to elicit their help in circulating the advertisement? Examples include:
  - College of Medicine Howard University
  - Meharry Medical College
  - Morehouse
  - Tougaloo

- Have we reached out to our networks already in existence at Brown?
  - Medeva Ghee, Director Leadership Alliance
  - Joseph Diaz, Associate Dean and Director of the Medical School’s Office of Diversity and Multicultural Affairs
  - Shontay Delalue, Interim VP of Office of Equity and Diversity
  - Katherine Sharkey, Assistant Dean, Office of Women in Medicine and Science

Diversity Representative/Committee Chair

- Has the Committee Chair and Diversity Representative adequately worked together to review whether the strategies for the search have been comprehensive in targeting potential diverse candidates? And if not, have steps been taken to address this before an initial round of candidates has been selected?

Committee composition (Responsible Point Person: Department Chair)

- Have you included members with different perspectives and expertise?

- Consider encouraging each committee member to train in bias. Examples include the IAT test (https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html)
Have you included women, individuals with gender diverse identities, and under-represented minorities when possible? This may not be possible from an equity standpoint because these individuals are often called on for additional service.

Have you explicitly empowered and acknowledged the role assigned to the diversity rep to actively “ask hard questions” and that you are in support of that as their assigned role to other committee members?

Have you adequately prepared the committee, explicitly stating the following for committee members verbally and/or if needed, provided appropriate written guidance?

- Lay out clear hiring/selection criteria. Ensure criteria is not assessed in terms of any single indicator which can limit selection of diverse candidates. Ideally this is a written assessment rubric and assessment plan.
- Clearly indicate the goal of identifying outstanding candidates including underrepresented minority candidates and women.
- Articulate that diversity and excellence are compatible goals.
- Overtly discuss how evaluation bias (usually in the form of unconscious/implicit bias) produces an unfair and inequitable search process.
Initial Pool

Initial Independent Review of Applications
☐ Have you encouraged all committee members to review applications individually, and to rank applicants independently, prior to meeting as a group with the rest of the committee? If reviews/rankings are done independently from other committee members, this limits the bias that can be perpetuated by a group dynamic.
☐ Have you created a system in which there is consistency in evaluations, interviews, and reference checks by using standard forms and standard questions? Consider a clear list of metrics with quantitative and qualitative evaluation components. Ideally this the application of a written assessment rubric and assessment plan.

Exclusion of Candidates after Independent Review
☐ Have you documented the rationale for search committee decisions and recommendations?

Diversity Representative/Committee Chair
☐ Have you presented data to the committee on representation of women and minorities in the interim applicant pool?
☐ Have you presented data relevant to bias that might affect initial exclusion of candidates after Independent Review?

Preparing a Short list or an “Interim Pool” in Preparation for Interview Invitations
☐ Consider a medium list to generate your short list. Are there women and minorities on your medium list? If not, consider intensifying the search before moving to the short list.

Diversity Representative/Committee Chair
☐ Have you presented data to the committee on representation of women and minorities (and individuals with diverse gender identities if this has been disclosed to you by the candidate) in the medium and short list?
Invitations/Interviews

☐ In interviews/job talks, consider who “represents” the institution including how people will be treated and who they meet with when they come.

☐ Individual meetings/interviews

✓ Consider consistent criteria to ensure a level playing field – for example “asking the same questions under the same conditions”. The goal here is to gather equivalent information from all candidates, so you will be able to evaluate them all in terms of the same criteria. This does not require use of uniform questions with all candidates, but does require care in obtaining comparable information.

✓ Consider how the department and University will be represented as a place in which women and minority faculty can thrive.

✓ Be consistent about who candidates are introduced to. Do not differentiate who candidates are introduced to or who they are interviewed by. If women and minority faculty members and other faculty with diverse backgrounds are expected to play an especially active role in recruiting new faculty, be sure to recognize this additional service burden in their overall service load.

✓ Formal talks may not reveal every candidate’s strengths. Consider including Q + A sessions, “chalk talks,” and other less formal interactions.
Selection and Offers

Discussion of interviews and priority list for hiring (to be submitted in the Hiring Report)

Exclusion of Candidates after interviews/job talks
☐ Have you provided documentation of the rationale for search committee decisions and recommendations?

Diversity Representative/Committee Chair
☐ Have you presented data relevant to bias that might affect exclusion of candidates after Interviews/Job talks?
☐ Have you presented data to the committee on representation of women and minorities (and other diverse identities include diverse gender identities as disclosed to you by candidates) in the final list?

Job offers
☐ Ensure equity – consult with the Dean of Faculty Affairs before discussing salary with the candidate.
☐ Has the Committee Chair and Diversity Representative worked together to utilize all resources the School/University can offer to attract diverse candidates who are extended offers?

Reflection and Review
☐ Find out how many members of underrepresented groups in your field have applied for post positions in your department as percentage of total applicant pool.
☐ Consider those who applied and were rejected; those who were invited for interviews and rejected, and those who were extended offers but refused.
☐ Attempt to find out why offers were turned down via exit interviews.

Diversity Representative/Committee Chair
☐ Has the Committee Chair and Diversity Representative worked together to review whether improvements can be made in the search strategy to improve diversity representation in the initial pool, after the medium/short list, and in the final list? Are there any further steps the School/University can take to attract candidates who are extended offers?

DATA CONSIDERATIONS: Track rationale for search committee decisions and recommendations in all minutes.

DATA CONSIDERATIONS: Track diversity representation in medium and short list (x/y=z%).
FACULTY SEARCH ROADMAP: 
DIVERSITY REPRESENTATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

Role: Thank you for serving in the vital role as Diversity Representative. Although the responsibility of ensuring the inclusion of a diverse candidate pool falls upon all committee members, you play a particularly important role as an advocate for ensuring diverse candidates are given full and equitable consideration. Your role is to ensure that members of underrepresented groups have been recruited as candidates and given full and careful consideration. You will have the full support of the search committee chair who will spell out your role which is to ask difficult questions for committee members to consider at each stage of the selection process. We ask that at each key crossroad in the search process, you explicitly introduce the issues and questions detailed below.

Position Advertisement
☐ Is the language of the announcement/advertisement attractive to diverse candidates?
✓ This can be vetted with the chair, other faculty members, etc.

Search Plan
☐ Have we cast as wide of a net as possible in targeting electronic job-posting services, websites, listservs, journals, and publications targeting diverse groups such as minority and women’s and LGBTQ caucuses or professional networks in our discipline?
☐ And if not, have we taken steps to address this before an initial round of candidates has been selected?

Invitations and Interviews
☐ Have you established consistent criteria and questions to ensure a level playing field?
☐ Have you considered alternatives to formal job talks?
☐ Have you avoided bias in the scheduling and assignment of interview roles?

Initial Pool
☐ Have you presented data relevant to bias that might affect initial exclusion of candidates?
☐ (HUG and women and other diversity background as disclosed to you by candidates) in the initial applicant pool is x/y=z%. The diversity representation in the initial applicant pool is x/y=z%. Have we done good enough of a job of considering

Selection & Offers
☐ Have you presented data relevant to bias that might affect initial exclusion of candidates after Interviews/Job talks?
☐ Have we done good enough of a job of considering diverse candidates for extending offers?
☐ Has the Committee Chair and Diversity Representative worked together to utilize all resources the School/University can offer to attract diverse candidates who are extended offers? And to review whether improvements can be made in the next search?
Depending on issues of potential bias that arise in the discussion, you can flag the following relevant evidence. Have we considered issues of bias in . . .

✓ **Letters of reference.** Trix and Psenka (2003) examined letters of reference for successful applicants for faculty positions in medical schools. They found that letters for men were longer, and contained more references to the curriculum vitae, publications, patient interactions and work with colleagues. Letters for women were shorter, contained more references to personal life and contained more doubt raising phrases.

✓ **Receipt of external grant awards.** NIH grant scores are biased, so if we evaluate based on grant-getting records, we may be perpetuating this bias. Ginther, D. K., Schaffer, W. T., Schnell, J., Masimore, B., Liu, F., Haak, L. L., & Kington, R. (2011). Race, ethnicity, and NIH research awards. Science 333: 1015-1019. When investigating the association between a U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH) R01 applicant’s self-identified race or ethnicity and the probability of receiving an award they found that although proposals with strong priority scores were equally likely to be funded regardless of race, Asians were 4 percentage points and black or African-American applicants were 13 percentage points less likely to receive NIH investigator-initiated research funding compared with whites. After controlling for the applicant’s educational background, country of origin, training, previous research awards, publication record, and employer characteristics, black applicants remained 10 percentage points less likely than whites to be awarded NIH research funding.

✓ **Receipt of Awards/Recognitions.** Lincoln, A. E., S. Pincus, et al. (2012). “The Matilda Effect in science: Awards and prizes in the US, 1990s and 2000s.” Social Studies of Science 42(2): 307–320. Science is stratified, with an unequal distribution of research facilities and rewards among scientists. Awards and prizes, which are critical for shaping scientific career trajectories, play a role in this stratification when they differentially enhance the status of scientists who already have large reputations. Evidence suggests that the scientific efforts and achievements of women do not receive the same recognition as do those of men. Authors examine research on gender bias in evaluations of research and analyze data from 13 STEM disciplinary societies. While women’s receipt of professional awards and prizes has increased in the past two decades, men continue to win a higher proportion of awards for scholarly research than expected based on their representation in the nomination pool. The results support the powerful twin influences of implicit bias and committee chairs as contributing factors. The analysis sheds light on the relationship of external social factors to women’s science careers and helps to explain why women are severely underrepresented as winners of science awards.

✓ **Gender bias.** Steinpreis, R.E., Anders, K.A. & Ritzke, D. (1999). The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job applicants and tenure candidates: A national empirical study. Sex Roles, 41, 7/8, 509–528. The authors of this study submitted the same CV for consideration by academic psychologists, sometimes with a man’s name at the top, sometimes with a woman’s. In one comparison, applicants for an entry-level faculty position were evaluated. Both men and women were more likely to hire the “male” candidate than the “female” candidate, and rated his qualifications as higher, despite identical credentials. In contrast, men and women were equally likely to recommend tenure for the “male” and “female” candidates (and rated their qualifications equally).

✓ **Gender diversity is a major issue in academia. We need to recruit candidates for diverse gender identities.** To read more about the experience of faculty with diverse gender identities, see here: Pitcher, Erich. (2018). Being and Becoming Professionally Other: Identities, Voices, and Experiences of U.S. Trans* Academics. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

✓ **We make assumptions based on names.** Oreopoulos, P. (2011). Why do skilled immigrants struggle in the Labor market. A field experiment with thirteen thousand resumes. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 3(4), 148-171. Thousands of randomly manipulated resumes were sent in response to online job postings in Toronto to investigate why immigrants, allowed in based on skill, struggle in the labor market. The study finds substantial discrimination across a variety of occupations towards
applicants with foreign experience or those with Indian, Pakistani, Chinese, and Greek names compared with English names. Listing language fluency, multinational firm experience, education from highly selective schools, or active extracurricular activities had no diminishing effect. Recruiters justify this behavior based on language skill concerns but fail to fully account for offsetting features.

✓ Other relevant issues of bias.
  o We often favor “peer” institutions (for example, other Ivys) but should consider other institutions for talent.
  o We often judge people based exclusively on our own experience. Evidence often is not used in arriving at evaluations/ratings.
  o We tend to favor people who look like us or have other experiences like our own.
  o Women and underrepresented minority candidates are penalized disproportionately if reviewers do not allocate adequate time (15–20 minutes) to reviewing their files.
  o Evaluation bias is minimized if you interview more than one woman and/or underrepresented minority candidate. Research indicates that interviewers evaluate women and underrepresented minorities more fairly when there is more than one woman in the interview pool. When there is only one woman or underrepresented minority, s/he is far less likely to succeed than women or minorities who are compared to a diverse pool of candidates.

We ask that you help guide the committee around appropriate and inappropriate inquiries (under the direction and leadership of the committee chair). The committee chair should also prepare those participating in the interview process (and attending the job talks) to follow these guidelines. See examples below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>APPROPRIATE INQUIRIES</th>
<th>INAPPROPRIATE INQUIRIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Questions about age, date of birth, requests for birth certificates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>May ask questions about legal authorization to work in the specific position if all applicants are asked</td>
<td>May not ask if a person is a US citizen or what citizenship the person holds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>May ask about applicant’s ability to perform job-related functions</td>
<td>Questions that are likely to solicit information about a disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital or parental status</td>
<td>Whether applicant can meet work schedule or job requirements. Should be asked of all genders</td>
<td>Any inquiry about marital status, children, pregnancy, or child care plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National origin</td>
<td>May ask if legally authorized to work in this specific position of all applicants</td>
<td>May not ask a person’s birthplace; of the person is a US citizen; questions about the person’s lineage, ancestry, descent, or parentage; how the person acquired the ability to speak/read/learn a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or color</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Comments about complexion or color of skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex at birth and gender identity</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Inquiries regarding gender, gender expression, or gender identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Comments or questions about the applicant’s sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adapted from University of Michigan Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring (http://advance.umich.edu/resources/handbook.pdf)**
Information resources:
This roadmap was compiled from a review of the literature and review of the following resources:

- University of Michigan ADVANCE program: [http://advance.umich.edu/resources/handbook.pdf](http://advance.umich.edu/resources/handbook.pdf)
- “Guidelines for Recruiting a Diverse Workforce.” Penn State University. Available online: [psu.edu/dept/aaoffice/pdf/guidelines.pdf](http://psu.edu/dept/aaoffice/pdf/guidelines.pdf)
- “Recruitment and Selection of Faculty and Academic Professional and Administrative Employees Appendix A: Recruiting a Diverse Qualified Pool of Applicants” University of Minnesota. [policy.umn.edu/hr/recruitfacpa-appa](http://policy.umn.edu/hr/recruitfacpa-appa)
- “Massachusetts Institute of Technology Faculty Search Committee Handbook.” (2002). [web.mit.edu/faculty/reports/FacultySearch.pdf](http://web.mit.edu/faculty/reports/FacultySearch.pdf)