

Promising Practices for Increasing Equity in Faculty Searches

A Case Study Report of



Department of Psychology
University of Washington
<https://psych.uw.edu/>

Note. This Department of Psychology Case Study serves as a set of documented experiences and recommendations for advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in faculty searches. The department's approach was built on the foundation of the University of Washington Office for Faculty Advancement's [Handbook of Best Practices for Faculty Searches](#)¹. This document describes the successful implementation of that guidance and generation of additional strategies that proved helpful in recruiting diverse faculty across multiple positions. We integrate recommendations backed by empirical evidence, experiences of search committee members, and departmental outcomes with practical examples that can be applied or modified in other units.

¹ Allen, 2019

Acknowledgments

Written and compiled by Ella J. Lombard and Zoe E. Ferguson, with funding from UW Natural Sciences Divisional Dean Dr. Daniel Pollack

Edited by UW Psychology's Diversity Advisory Committee
and UW Psychology Chair Dr. Cheryl Kaiser

With contributions from search committee chairs (see below)

Diversity Advisory Committee:

Dr. Sapna Cheryan

Dr. William George

Dr. Joseph Sisneros

Bryn Bandt-Law

2020-2021 Search Committee Chairs:

Dr. Sapna Cheryan

Dr. Andrew Meltzoff

Dr. Joseph Sisneros

Index

- [Executive Summary](#)
- [Preparation](#)
 - General Principles
 - Forming Your Search Committee
 - Recruiting a Diverse Applicant Pool
 - Writing Your Job Advertisement
- [The Application Package](#)
 - General Principles
 - Application Components & Considerations
 - Example Flow for Reviewing Application Package Components
- [Candidate Evaluation](#)
 - General Principles
 - Self-Auditing
 - Tips for Operationalizing Evaluative Criteria
 - Rubric Examples
- [First Round Interviews](#)
 - General Principles
 - Examples of First-Round Interview Questions
 - Examples of DEI-Focused Interview Questions
- [Final Round Interviews](#)
 - General Principles
 - Interview Components
 - Communicating Department Culture
 - Conflicts of Interest
 - Notes on the Remote Interview Experience
 - Example Message to Candidate with Interview Details
- [Mentorship Checks](#)
 - General Principles
 - Process
 - Examples Message to Candidate to Solicit Mentee Contacts
 - Example Questions for Mentees
- [Next Steps](#)
 - General Principles
 - Candidate Debriefs
 - Feedback Gathered from Department
 - Bias in Department Evaluations
 - Example of Department Survey

- Search Committee Decision-Making and Offers
 - Rejections
- [Other Resources](#)
- [References](#)
- Appendix
 - [UW Psychology Faculty Searches by the Numbers](#)
 - [Timeline Overview](#)

Executive Summary

Context

This case study report summarizes the practices that the Department of Psychology used in the 2020-2021 academic year to conduct faculty searches across three separate research areas and hire five new tenure track faculty members, three of whom are women and all of whom are people of color (BIPOC). These searches were conducted entirely remotely due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Objectives

This case study aims to answer 3 primary questions:

1. What actions did search committees in the Psychology department take to **prepare for success** before and in the initial stages of their searches?
2. In what ways did searches **center equitable practices in determining how candidates would be evaluated?**
3. How was the **remote interview experience designed to promote DEI**, from interview questions to the structure of the schedule to follow-up actions?

Key Recommendations

Our recommendations are based on the documented practices of UW Psychology's three faculty searches in the 2020-2021 academic year; empirical evidence; and search committee members' reported experiences. These recommendations are grouped into four broad, intersecting categories, each targeted to create a faculty search environment characterized by inclusion and equity that leads to the recruitment of a diverse faculty over time.

1. **Soliciting a broad and diverse pool of candidates.** The foundation for a successful search is a pool of interested candidates who represent diverse backgrounds, identities, and strengths. Searches can maximize their success by investing time on the front end in relationship-building, recruitment, and crafting a welcoming call for applications.
2. **Standardizing the experience across candidates.** Ensuring a consistent experience for candidates guards against many forms of bias and increases the chances of selecting the best candidate(s) for the job. It is crucial to implement standardized interviews, evaluation criteria, etc.
3. **Adopting data-driven approaches to closing diversity gaps within the department.** Searches should draw both upon external evidence (e.g., results from research studies) and internal evidence (e.g., outcomes of previous searches within the department) to

construct a search strategy that maximizes equitable practices and addresses the unit's specific needs.

4. **Assessing how underlying assumptions and conventions may reproduce inequitable hierarchies.** Bias can be subtle, embedded in what institutions and individuals value or consider normal.² Attending to features of the search like the wording of job advertisements, how components of the evaluation rubric are defined, and how interview questions are presented to candidates can help dismantle hidden obstacles to equity.

Soliciting a Broad and Diverse Pool of Candidates

See "[Preparation](#)".

Implementation Steps:

- Write a job advertisement that is equitable, informative, and encouraging.
- Advertise broadly (e.g., through social media, email lists)
- Reach out directly to potential candidates and scholars who can spread the word
- Use established connections and relationships to encourage applications and solicit help advertising

Standardizing the Experience Across Candidates

See "[The Application Package](#)", "[Candidate Evaluation](#)", "[First Round Interviews](#)", and "[Final Round Interviews](#)".

Implementation Steps:

- Provide word limits on application components.
- Use standardized questions in all interviews.
- Establish standard expectations for all aspects of the interview process (e.g., whether candidates will have cameras off or on for video conference interviews.)
- Use a consistent rubric with pre-set criteria to evaluate all candidates. Establish how each component of the rubric will be defined and measured and whether there will be changes in evaluation as the search progresses to its later rounds.

Adopting Data-Driven Approaches to Closing Diversity Gaps

See all sections, especially "[Candidate Evaluation](#)".

Implementation Steps:

- **Follow established bias-reduction guidance** based on empirical evidence (e.g., [UW Handbook](#))

² Cheryan & Markus, 2020

- **Conduct internal audits of past searches** in the department to identify sources of inequitable outcomes and alter practices for the present search.
- **Conduct internal ongoing audits** as the present search progresses to identify areas of concern and make any needed adjustments.

Assessing How Underlying Assumptions/Conventions May Reproduce Inequities

See all sections.

Implementation Steps:

- **Deconstruct how evaluating candidates based on certain characteristics** (e.g., productivity, verbal fluency under pressure, charisma, likeability, visionary leadership) may advantage privileged groups over underrepresented groups.
- **Construct evaluation criteria and interview questions** in response by:
 - Screening job advertisement text for **masculine language**
 - Adopting a **minimum threshold of productivity**
 - **Providing interview questions to candidates ahead of time**
 - Training department members to **avoid commenting on candidates' likeability**
 - Asking interview questions that **invite specific evidence of past behavior**

Preparation

Forming the search committee and initial applicant pool.

General Principles

- Start with University [resources](#)
- Connect with your Department Chair and then decide how you will structure the composition, work division strategy, and access levels of your committee (i.e., who will have access to which parts of the application; see below for more detail).
- Putting in effort up front to recruit a broad and diverse applicant pool is crucial to a successful search -- advertise broadly, use word of mouth, and cold-email potential candidates.
- Optimize the wording of your job advertisement: as the first point of contact candidates will have with your search, the ad can be instrumental in encouraging or discouraging people from applying.
- See "[Candidate Evaluation](#)" for details on how to start preparing your evaluation strategy

Forming Your Search Committee

- Department Chairs should work with the committee chair to choose committee members who represent multiple career stages (e.g., include a grad student representative) and areas of expertise (e.g., include a faculty member who is outside the main topical area of the search, if applicable)
- Assign specific roles/tasks (e.g., one person could be responsible for internal auditing at each stage, one person could remind everyone which topics are off-limits in interviews and keep the group on track, one person could make calls to candidates' former mentees)
- Decide who will have access to application materials
 - Will faculty who are not on the committee have access? (We opted to keep the application materials need-to-know only)
 - Will graduate student representatives have access to potentially sensitive information such as letters of recommendation? (In our searches, graduate student reps had access to all application materials except letters of recommendation)
- Will your search committee collaborate with any DEI-focused entities? Our search committees regularly updated and solicited feedback from Psychology's Diversity Advocacy Committee, a departmental committee whose mission was to support and provide oversight in increasing equitable practices for all department searches.

Recruiting a Diverse Applicant Pool

The most crucial initial step to an equitable faculty search is recruiting a broad, diverse initial pool of candidates. Below are some principles our committees followed to maximize this stage and successfully recruit.

Advertise Through Listservs

- Advertise broadly in listservs for your field/area of interest.
- Contact identity-specific groups (e.g., BIPOC listservs, LGBTQIA+ professional groups).

Leverage Social Media

- Promote the job posting among your colleagues and on social media (e.g., Twitter, Facebook), and ask your colleagues to help you encourage people to apply.
- Post on department website.

Directly email scholars who may be a good fit

- Directly emailing potential candidates and encouraging them to apply/asking them to encourage others to apply is a highly effective strategy. One of our searches sent over 100 personal emails, primarily to URM³ researchers.
 - Make sure you are contacting people whose profile of work, including scholarship, teaching, and service, aligns with your search's priorities. Do not contact URM scholars primarily or solely on the basis of their race/ethnicity.
- Compile a list and reach out to each person individually. Strategies for building your list below:
 - Write down every scholar you know of who might be interested.
 - Ask other members of your department to contribute names, especially senior faculty for nominations and reaching out to those they nominate.
 - Retrieve names from conference presentations in your field/area of interest, including smaller conferences and those focused on social justice, diversity, and equity when possible.
 - Search conference programs or professional associations in your field/area of interest for lists of graduate student award winners, including diversity awards.

³ "Underrepresented minority" is defined in U.S. higher education and in this document as scholars who are Black/African American, Latinx/Hispanic, or American Indian/Indigenous. In contrast, we identify people of color (BIPOC) as those who identify with at least one non-white racial group, whether or not those racial groups are numerically underrepresented in academia. For the purposes of this document, a Latinx scholar would be identified as both URM and BIPOC, while an Asian American or Middle Eastern American scholar would be identified as BIPOC but not URM.

- Search by funding mechanism program announcements (e.g., in our searches: NIH R01 minority supplement, NRSA F31/32; NSF SBE Broadening Participation-postdocs; Ford Foundation fellowship winners, dissertation award winners)
- Reach out to people you and your colleagues have mentored or taught, even briefly.

Encourage people to apply even if they are not currently on the job market. If you have done anything to make the application process easier (e.g., not requiring letters of recommendation in the first stage), include that information.

Before the Search: Invest time in building relationships

- Keep an eye out for scholars who may be coming on the job market in the next few years (e.g., through professional connections or presentations at conferences).
- Interact with a wide range of colleagues (including junior and URM scholars) at conferences. Attend their presentations and initiate contact at networking events.
- Invite URM scholars to give talks at your institution, even years before they are on the job market.

Writing Your Job Advertisement

- Refer to the **rules and guidelines that apply to your unit and institution** with regards to what is appropriate to include in a job advertisement.
- Build your rubric first, then **make sure your job advertisement closely parallels your rubric**. Candidates should be able to infer from the advertisement what your priorities are and what they will be evaluated on.
- **Attend carefully to the wording** you use in your advertisement -- this is the first point of contact potential candidates will have with your search and their first chance to form impressions about whether it is worth applying.
 - **Consider making review dates flexible** rather than fixed in order to remove barriers to applying (e.g., adding “applications will be thoughtfully reviewed and considered until the position is filled”).
 - **Avoid using masculine language**, which can deter women from applying and feeling they would belong in the position⁴ (try [this tool](#) that can help you find subtle gender bias in your job ad wording!)
 - Steer away from wording that may self-select for highly confident candidates (e.g., genius, trailblazer, pioneer, rockstar, top of field). Men

⁴ Gaucher, Friesen, & Kay, 2011

may be more likely than women to think that these descriptors apply to them.

- **Avoid language that favors prestigious or high-status academic backgrounds:** it may lead the search to overlook valuable untapped talent and may reinforce class, race, and gender disparities because of differences in who has access to prestigious institutions. (e.g., referring to “reputable universities”)
- Consider choosing wording that leaves room for candidates to **demonstrate their ability to grow or develop** into aspects of the job posting they may not yet fulfill (e.g., “have or develop a record of high-quality publications and a funded research program”) to encourage a wide range of candidates to apply.
- Visualize your ideal candidates and work backwards from there to word your advertisement. **If you could pick anyone, with an eye towards URM scholars, which current scholars in your field would be the best fit for this job?** How do they describe their work and goals? Consider using similar language to communicate your unit’s priorities.

Job Advertisement Example

EXAMPLE

The Department of [NAME] at the [UNIVERSITY] invites applicants at [RANK] for a [POSITION] in [FIELD]. We seek applicants who research and core training [insert broad list of research topics]. We are most interested in candidates with research specializations that address [insert more specific lines of research that would be considered compatible with this application]. A strong component of the candidate’s research portfolio should include [insert a major component you are looking for].

Qualifications

Applicants will be expected to provide high quality teaching and mentoring at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. We are particularly interested in candidates who have a strong commitment to promoting the success of students from underrepresented groups in academia. The successful candidate is expected to have or develop a record of high-quality publications and a funded research program. All faculty at the [UNIVERSITY] engage in teaching, research, and service. Applicants should have a Ph.D. degree, or foreign equivalent, by the start of the appointment.

Applicant instructions

Applications should include a curriculum vitae, a statement of research interests, a statement of teaching interests, three references who can be contacted for letters of recommendation, a research sample of no more than 2-3 reprints or preprints, and a diversity statement of no

more than 500 words. The diversity statement should address leadership, commitment, and experiences with diversity, equity, and inclusion. Applications must be submitted electronically through [LINK].

Review of applications will begin on [DATE], but applications will be thoughtfully reviewed and considered until the position is filled. This position has an anticipated start date of [DATE]. Tenure-track or tenured faculty have an annual service period of XX months (DATES).

Equal Employment Opportunity Statement

University of Washington is an affirmative action and equal opportunity employer. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, pregnancy, genetic information, gender identity or expression, age, disability, or protected veteran status.

Commitment to Diversity

We are committed to creating a diverse and inclusive departmental climate. You can learn more about our department at: <http://www.psych.uw.edu/psych.php?p=10>. The University of Washington is committed to building diversity among its faculty, librarian, staff, and student communities, and articulates that commitment in the UW Diversity Blueprint (<http://www.washington.edu/diversity/diversity-blueprint/>). Additionally, the University's Faculty Code recognizes faculty efforts in research, teaching and/or service that address diversity and equal opportunity as important contributions to a faculty member's academic profile and responsibilities (<https://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#2432>).

The Application Package

General Principles

- **Consider which components you will evaluate at which stages.** You may not need all the materials in the initial package, and could defer some components (e.g., recommendation letters) to later stages to reduce burden on candidates at initial application as well as the committee.
- **Continue to develop and refine your evaluation criteria** (see “[Candidate Evaluation](#)”) and discuss how each component of the application package will be used to assess candidates on those criteria.

Application Components & Considerations

- Research statement
- Teaching statement
- Diversity statement
 - Requesting diversity statements invokes a delicate balance between giving candidates the opportunity to provide insight into their lived experiences and making candidates feel pressure to disclose or feeling that they are at risk of being tokenized. Some things to consider:
 - **Consider making the diversity statement required rather than optional** to (a) communicate that diversity is a high priority in your search/department; and (b) equalize the amount of work candidates must put into their application packages.
 - Providing multiple pathways to answering the prompt may help candidates feel in control of how much information they disclose. The prompt could specify that candidates can write about their own experiences with identity, their DEI-related activities and service, etc.
 - **Providing a word count limit and keeping the statement relatively brief** can also reduce burden on candidates.
- Curriculum vitae
- Letters of recommendation

- **Consider *not* asking for letters of recommendation in the initial application package** to minimize barriers to entry. After the first cut, solicit letters for remaining candidates.
 - Disadvantage of this approach: Potentially overlooking candidates whose letters may have provided valuable additional information (e.g., whether the applicant is URM).
 - Advantage of this approach: Reduces burden on candidates and increases likelihood that candidates who are not actively on the job market will decide to apply.

Example Flow for Reviewing Application Package Components

First round: CVs, research statements, diversity statements

Second round: research statements, papers, letters of recommendation

Third round: teaching/mentorship statements, calls to faculty who work with or know candidates

Fourth round: [first-round interviews](#), all above materials

Fifth round: [final-round interviews](#), [mentee interviews](#), and all above materials

Candidate Evaluation

General Principles

- **Use a consistent rubric with pre-set criteria** to evaluate candidates' application materials and guide committee discussions.
 - Consider starting with a model from a different search and working as a committee to modify it to your unit's needs.
- Decide whether there will be **different evaluation criteria at different stages of the selection process**, and if so, how those differences will be implemented.
 - Which evaluative categories will you use to make your first cut? Second cut? Third? **Consider placing contributions to diversity high on the list**/as a criterion candidates must pass to make it to the second round.
 - Will the expected threshold to make it to the next round change at different stages of the process? If so, how?
- **Consider a minimum publishing productivity cutoff** in the first stage and **departing from productivity as an evaluation criterion** in subsequent stages. An alternative is to have no productivity cutoff at all.
 - White men were able to be most productive throughout the COVID-19 pandemic in academia, while **women and especially Black women faced disproportionate barriers to productivity**.⁵
 - Even prior to the pandemic, **unequal service participation among faculty left White men with more time to focus on publication**, while men of color, White women, and women of color participated in internal service work at much higher rates.⁶
 - Taking traditional measures of "academic productivity" (e.g., number of publications) with a grain of salt is one simple way to help offset these inequities to level the playing field for all candidates.
- **Use self-auditing (see below) to identify past criteria that produced biased results** and remove or modify them.
- Assign a committee member to be responsible for preventing people from talking about things that are not part of the criteria.
- How much will candidates know about how they are being evaluated? From your job advertisement, is it clear what the main categories of evaluation will be and what materials they will be assessed on? Will you provide candidates any additional information throughout the process on what you are looking for?

⁵ Andersen et al., 2020; King & Frederickson, 2021; Staniscuaski et al., 2021

⁶ Guarino & Borden, 2017; Miller & Roksa, 2019

Food for Thought: Which evaluation criteria could use a “minimum threshold” strategy?

With a minimum threshold strategy, all candidates who meet or exceed a certain standard are retained, rather than ranking candidates according to their proficiency in that standard.

Example: Publishing Productivity

- **Instead of** ranking someone with 10 publications more highly than someone with 8 or 9
- **Try** considering what threshold represents “productive enough” in your field. Perhaps any candidate who has more than 8 papers is considered qualified; applicants with 9 and 10 papers would be ranked the same.

In one of our searches, the productivity threshold was set at one first-authored paper in one of the journals the search committee identified as central to the research area of interest.

Self-Auditing

Using data to assess areas of bias in the evaluation process is **crucial to an equitable search**.

Self-auditing should be done both retroactively (i.e., analyzing past searches) **and continuously** (i.e., throughout the present search.)

- **First, audit previous searches to identify which criteria may be sources of bias -- when were URM candidates dropped, and why?** On which criteria did White candidates, male candidates, etc. tend to receive higher scores? Use this initial audit to guide the creation of a rubric for the present search.
 - One of our searches used this process and realized that “open science” requirements (publicly posting data, hypotheses, and materials to guard against accusations of selectively reporting results or falsifying data) produced biased results. We subsequently dropped open science as an evaluation criterion.
 - Adding the criteria of “diversity leadership” to the Diversity category of the rubric proved to increase our retention of URM candidates at various phases of the creation of lists.
- **Determine who has disclosed URM identity in your candidate pool.** In order to audit policies or practices that may have inequitable impact, it is helpful to have data on when and why URM candidates are being dropped from your pool. Construct a spreadsheet of candidate names and use diversity statements and other application materials to track the demographic information that candidates voluntarily provide. There will likely be some candidates for whom demographic info is not available (i.e., a wide range among candidates in level of comfort disclosing race).

- At each stage of the search process, **run a series of checks to see how the current criteria are operating**. At minimum, evaluate what is happening by race and gender separately and for women of color. Use these audits to **adjust criteria and practices as needed**.
- **Assign someone to check specifically for URM candidates who were dropped at each stage**. Why did the committee pass on them? Could/should they be brought back into the next stage? In some searches, dropped URM candidates were automatically given a second look before moving on.
- If you have the access/resources, **consider assigning a staff member** to help examine the data and make recommendations.

Tips for Operationalizing Evaluative Criteria

- Discuss with your committee how each criterion will be operationalized. **Generate clear, objective, and standardized definitions for what it means to meet or exceed criteria**.
 - E.g., what does “research quality” mean? In one of our searches, some committee members thought high sample sizes should be prioritized, while others preferred evidence of attending to intersectionality⁷. The committee concluded that both would be used to evaluate research quality, but that candidates only had to meet expectations in one, not both, to move forward to the next round.
- **Solicit feedback on your rubrics and operationalization guidance** from stakeholders, including students and diversity groups whenever possible.
- Consider diversity as both its own category and integrated with other categories (e.g., teaching, mentoring). **Integrate DEI work into as many evaluation criteria as possible**.
- Use serving as a role model for URM students as part of your definition of diversity.
- **What does the field need more of?** Use this question to guide your evaluation criteria.
- **What organizational values will guide your evaluations?** Values-based judgments are likely to be present in the search process whether or not you intend them to be. Start a conversation with your committee about the guiding values of your community and why they are important to **make this process intentional** rather than automatic.
 - Are any of your community’s underlying values likely to lead to bias or inequity? (e.g., confidence, certainty, verbal fluency under pressure.) Can they be replaced or shifted to something that will promote equity instead? (e.g., community-building, humility, collaboration.)

⁷ Crenshaw, 1989

Food for Thought: Assessing culture fit & collegiality

You may have a category that addresses how the candidate would fit into your community and their social behavior toward colleagues. (In our searches, “collegiality”.) **These criteria can be crucial to building a positive culture, but can also be subjective or prone to bias.** How will you define this criterion and minimize the chances that it will be differently applied to candidates based on identity?

- We decided that **collegiality is not about being likeable.** (Lack of perceived likeability is infamously weaponized against women in leadership roles⁸). Instead, it is about treating others, especially students and others with lower status, with respect.
- Some of the guiding questions our committees used to start conversations about **collegiality**:
 - How will this candidate interact with colleagues, **especially students and staff**?
 - Does this candidate prioritize/have an established history of **collaboration**?
 - Would this candidate **engage in and care about** our community?
 - Are there any **red flags** of dysfunctional behavior, especially toward students or staff? Have **multiple people** reported that this candidate is toxic?

Some of the mechanisms our committees used to answer these questions:

- Meetings with grad students during interviews and grad student perceptions of the candidate (see “[Final Round Interviews](#)”).
- Emails/calls to past mentees of the candidate (see “[Mentorship Checks](#)”) to see if any mentees have left the applicant’s lab or had other difficulties.
- **Collegiality checks** conducted by using connections and relationships in the field to ask trusted others about whether the candidate has exhibited toxic behavior. If **multiple people** reported toxic behavior, collegiality would be considered a potential concern.

Rubric Examples

These rubrics were constructed to guide the evaluation of candidates’ CVs and statements of research, teaching, diversity, letters of recommendation, and interviews. The rubric categories were also used to solicit feedback from all members of the department who attended interview events. Note: these rubrics are examples of scientific research faculty positions in Psychology and criteria will need to be adapted for other units. *Suggested materials* are different components of the application that could be used to gather ratings on various rubric criteria.

⁸ Eagly & Karau, 2002

Criteria in Every Rubric:

Criteria	Description	Ratings (1-5)	comments
Research focus/ research fit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PhD (or intended) in <i>[area/field of interest]</i> or published in at least one <i>[area/field of interest]</i> journal ● Evidence of <i>[priority topic]</i>-related work, defined as <i>[definition here]</i> ● At least one first-authored publication (pre-tenure) or two first- or last- authored publications (post-tenure) in specified journals, e.g., <i>[examples of appropriate top-tier journals in the field]</i> ● Domain of research will strengthen the department as a whole. Particular domains of interest include but are not limited to <i>[priority topics]</i> <p>Suggested materials: CV, research statement</p>		
Research Potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Potential to produce high quality research to the field (relative to career opportunities), evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ publication number ○ publication quality ○ grant funding ○ sample sizes, power, intersectionality perspectives ● Quality is to be weighed over quantity <p>Suggested materials: CV</p>		
Diversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Takes the perspective of marginalized populations in their research ● Uses diverse samples ● Evidence of leadership in diversity initiative ● Potential role model to URM students in department ● Concrete evidence of behavior (preferable) or explicit desire/commitment for recruiting, mentoring, and educating students from diverse populations 		

	Suggested materials: research statement, teaching and diversity statement, letters of recommendation		
Teaching/ mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Potential for high quality teaching and mentorship of students ● Evidence of teaching competence, innovative methods, etc. ● Mentorship of URM students Suggested materials: teaching and diversity statement		
Service/ collegiality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of willingness to work with others in the department ● Being a collegial, collaborative, and team player Suggested materials: calls to mentees, on-campus interviews, letters of recommendation		

Criteria Not in Every Rubric:

Broad thinking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Seeing beyond concrete goals of projects ● Thinking broadly to connect ideas to world ● Ability to bridge to other areas and fields ● Consideration of race/ethnicity and social identity in their research Suggested materials: research statement		
Overlap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Right amount of overlap with current area members ● Extent to which research would in effect add +1 faculty and make the whole greater than sum or parts Suggested materials: CV		

Training in [area/field of interest]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core training in theory and methods in <i>[area/field of interest]</i>, such that applicant's 'core identity' is likely to be as a <i>[scholar of area/field of interest]</i> (with interdisciplinary interests), rather than someone who is broad, but who has not been steeped in <i>[area/field of interest]</i>. <p>Suggested materials: CV</p>		
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of multiple and/or innovative approaches to studying <i>[area/field of interest]</i> • Research is statistically and methodologically sound • Inventive research likely to open/contribute to a new direction in the field as a whole, and to our department <p>Suggested materials: CV, research statement</p>		
Inter-disciplinary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complements other research areas in the department with evidence of cross-disciplinary interests (background, training, scholarship, teaching) • Potential links to other related units on campus. <p>Suggested materials: CV, research statement</p>		

First Round Interviews

General Principles

- **Use standardized questions** so that candidates are provided with a consistent interview experience.
- **Steer clear of questions that do not relate to the pre-set criteria.** It may be helpful to assign someone to be in charge of monitoring this and **reminding interviewers which topics are not relevant** to evaluation.
- **Steer clear of questions that are not legally permitted.** While it is illegal to discriminate on the basis of one's race, skin color, religion, sex, gender, sexual orientation, pregnancy, national origin, age, disability, or genetic information, you are not barred from asking *any* questions about these identities. You must be mindful of the restrictions that come with asking such questions (see [the UW's Fair Pre-employment Inquiry Guidelines](#) for more examples).
- Write questions that emphasize **specific evidence of past behaviors in line with your priorities** (e.g., "Tell us about a time you...") rather than abstract, future-oriented questions (e.g., "How would you approach ____ if you were in this position?")
 - Questions about the past are more informative than questions about the future. Anyone can say their intentions align with your search's priorities; what does their established record reveal?
 - Future-oriented questions reward **visionary, charismatic** responses (candidates who can "dream big"), but visionary responses do not ensure competence, and men are perceived as higher in visionary leadership than women.⁹

Food for Thought: Providing candidates with questions in advance

We recommend sending interview questions to candidates ahead of time. Providing questions ahead of time can help prioritize deep and broad thinking rather than simply rewarding verbal fluency under pressure.

Why?

- Rewarding spontaneous verbal participation as evidence of deep thinking could advantage White American candidates¹⁰
- Rewarding performance under pressure could trigger **stereotype threat** and disadvantage underrepresented groups in the context of interviews at a

⁹ Ibarra & Obodaru, 2009

¹⁰ Kim, 2002

predominantly White institution. Stereotype threat arises when individuals worry that they will conform to stereotypes about their group and, consequently, perform worse due to the additional pressure.¹¹

Phone Interviews

- Consider keeping initial virtual (i.e., phone/Zoom) interviews **audio-only** to reduce visual-related bias (i.e., on the basis of age, race/ethnicity, appearance, weight, physical disability, etc.¹²).
 - Resist the temptation to make video “optional” -- remember that nothing in the interview process is free from power dynamics or inferred meaning for candidates. Instead, **create a standardized expectation regarding whether cameras will be on or off for the interview.**
- Interviews can be recorded (with applicant’s consent) for review.
- Phone interviews enable you to **reach and interface with a larger pool of candidates** before reducing your pool to those invited to in-person interviews. Consider retaining virtual interviews post-COVID19 to maximize your information on a wider range of candidates.

Examples of First-Round Interview Questions

1. What are the research questions you hope to address the next 5 years?
2. What methodologies are you planning on establishing in your lab over the next 5 years? Are there any specific collaborations you could imagine developing at our University?
3. How do you think your work would contribute to and expand the research we have at UW?
4. Why do you want to work in our department?
5. Do you have any questions for us?

Examples of DEI-Focused Interview Questions

Pick 1-2 for phone/Zoom interviews and ask the rest in a final-round Diversity interview.

¹¹ Steele, 1997

¹² Derous et al., 2016

1. How has your experience in teaching and mentorship impacted the way you approach working with a diverse staff, trainees and student body?
2. What is your definition of diversity? What are some experiences or other factors that have contributed to or expanded your understanding of diversity? How have you approached diversity, equity and inclusion in the classrooms, labs and departments you have been a part of?
3. Could you reflect on what you see as the challenges in creating and maintaining an inclusive learning/mentorship environment. Are there specific examples of things you've done personally to meet these challenges in the past? How might you seek to address these challenges as a faculty member?
4. How have you worked with people under your supervision to foster a climate receptive to diversity?
5. Do you have any questions about DEI in the department?

Final Round Interviews

General Principles

- **Continue to use standardized questions in interviews** where possible.
- **Continue to provide interview questions for all meetings to candidates** ahead of time where possible.
- **Continue to communicate the pre-set criteria to interviewers** and encourage them to avoid topics that are not relevant to those criteria.
- **Use multiple interviewers rather than one-on-one interviews** to reduce the likelihood of inappropriate interview questions or interactions. Using multiple interviewers also helps to keep the interview standardized and can increase efficiency/reduce interview load for candidates.
- If job talks are remote, **consider whether you will request live or prerecorded talks from candidates.**
 - In our searches, we used pre-recorded talks in an effort to minimize Zoom fatigue (see example message below). We later received feedback that indicated pre-recorded talks may have placed a heavier burden on women candidates, who reported that they felt the need to re-record the talks multiple times to get them perfect. It is unclear whether pre-recorded talks are becoming normalized in the academic community over time and may present less of a burden now or in future than they did at the time of our searches.

Interview Components

Our searches' interviews included the following events¹³:

- Job talk (60 mins; grad students, post-docs, & faculty attending)
- Paper meeting (60 mins; Open Q&A about paper sent ahead of time; grad students, post-docs, & faculty attending)
 - We had particularly positive experiences with this event in our searches!
- Coffee hour (60 mins; faculty & post-docs; casual atmosphere)
 - Good to have a plan for some topics and a system to give everyone a chance to talk, especially if coffee hour is remote!
- Interviews/Meetings (30 mins each to reduce burden on candidate)
 - Search committee members*
 - Faculty who organize(s) teaching*
 - Area faculty*

¹³ Schedules varied slightly by search. The meetings marked with an asterisk were present in the schedules of candidates for some, but not all, searches.

- Area graduate students
 - Plan to provide grad students with applicant information and examples of good interview questions; many will have very little interviewing experience. Check in and see what questions they are asking so that adjustments can be made if needed.
- Diversity committee
 - For URM candidates, use this meeting to **emphasize how the department and the diversity committee are prepared to support the candidate** rather than evaluating them as an “asset” to the department’s diversity work
 - Assess all candidates’ previous and planned contribution to the foundations of diversity, equity, and inclusion work.
- Faculty of color and women faculty in the department
 - We included this meeting for women and faculty of color candidates to give them a glimpse of the shared-identity community available to them in our department and to give them a chance to learn about the experiences of other faculty who share aspects of their identity.
- Department chair and/or dean
- Goodbye and next steps with candidate

Communicating Department Culture

The entire search process, and especially the final round interviews, communicates the department’s culture to candidates. Below are some practices we used to demonstrate to candidates what it would be like to join our department.

- Communicate with candidates with respect and transparency at all times. **Be clear with all candidates on what to expect, what is happening** (e.g., provide the schedule for final round interviews ahead of time), **and the timeline for receiving news**. Provide interview questions prior to interviews.
 - Using these strategies to build positive relationships and trust with candidates increases the likelihood of **maintaining beneficial connections** even with candidates who do not move forward in the search.
- **Emphasize an energy of recruitment, not just evaluation, to department members who will be involved in interviews and communicate that priority explicitly** (e.g., expressing that challenging questions at job talks are encouraged, but aggressive ones are not).

- At this stage of the interview process, it is likely that every candidate is highly qualified, and acting with a recruitment mindset can maximize success (i.e., candidates accepting offers).
- **High departmental engagement at interview events is key.** Having good attendance across a range of roles (i.e., grad student, post-docs, faculty), thoughtful questions, and friendly engagement will help demonstrate the department's positive culture.
- It may be helpful to **assign someone to make sure faculty plan to attend key events**, especially casual events (e.g., coffee hour)
- Encouraging grad students to ask questions at the job talks and paper meetings, and **allowing their questions to be voiced ahead of faculty questions**, can help reinforce engagement and showcase a vibrant academic environment.

Before the Search: Build a department culture you are proud to be part of

The foundation for a successful search is built long before the search committee is convened, through building a department-wide culture of support and collaboration, addressing equity issues as they arise, and investing resources and time in DEI work. Explore more resources [here](#).

Conflicts of Interest

The Department should have a conflict of interest (COI) policy to use during searches. If not, one option is to borrow a policy from another department (e.g., the Biology department has a COI policy we have used in the past). **All COIs should be declared by all committee members, and anyone assigned to evaluate an application with a COI should be reassigned.** Committees can decide whether committee members are allowed to be in the room for discussion but quiet or will need to leave the room when that person is being discussed. If one of the candidates on the offer list has a COI with one of the committee members, the faculty should be told and the procedures the committee used should be reviewed.

Notes on the Remote Interview Experience

Our search committee chairs reflected on **multiple unexpected advantages to the remote interview process**, with some even considering that retaining a partly or fully remote interview model could be beneficial even post-COVID-19. Below are some of their observations on the remote interview experience.

- Remote search committee work felt more **efficient and focused**. Online material integration enabled the committee to all look at the same materials and stay on track. It

seemed anecdotally that there was less “side chatter” about candidates, which may have contributed to fairness.

- Using an initial round of phone/Zoom interviews before the final round allowed the committee to speak with a **wider pool of candidates, which was beneficial for building relationships even with those who were not selected** and for making more holistic decisions about who to put through to the next round.
- **The remote interview environment was highly controllable.** There was more structure and standardization and less room for unexpected or unplanned developments that could have compromised fairness.
- The motivation to reduce Zoom fatigue made it **easier to avoid one-on-one interviews** (see “General Principles” for why it is preferable to use multiple interviewers).

Example of Message to Candidate With Interview Details

EXAMPLE

Dear [candidate],

We are very much looking forward to welcoming you to [UNIVERSITY] to interview! Here are some initial details about your interviews and what we need from you (i.e., choice of dates).

Dates

Below are our available dates, please rank your top four dates and send back to me by [XX DATE], if possible:

[Date options]

Schedule

Interviews will be over two half-days. For example, if your interview is on [date] and [date], your interview hours would be approximately [time] on [date] and X-X pm on [date] (Pacific time). Your job talk + live Q&A will be [time] m on the first day.

Job talk

We will be asking you to send us approximately 30-minute recorded talks at least 2 days before your job talk. We recommend having you and your slides visible. As part of your talk, please introduce yourself (name, current position, institution) at the beginning.

We are not expecting flawless delivery or amazing production with these talks. Occasional background distractions, stops and starts, brief stumbles are totally okay (and make the experience feel more “live” for the audience). Our main purpose in prerecording is to minimize the number of interview hours to prevent Zoom fatigue.

If you have questions on how to record your talk, feel free to reach out to me. You could use Zoom or Panopto (or any other software) to record your talks. We'd prefer them in mp4 format but can work with a range of formats if you let us know ahead of time which format you'll be using.

Meetings and other events

On the second interview day, we will have a "paper meeting" in which faculty and students will read a paper of yours and have a discussion about the paper with you. We are hoping to use it as an opportunity to talk more about future directions, so if you have a paper that is in an area you hope to continue working on, that would be most helpful. The paper can be published or in progress. I'll ask you to send along the paper to me about a week before your interview to give us sufficient time to read it. At the beginning of the session, we'll ask you to briefly (less than 5 min) introduce the paper and tell us the origin of the paper (why you became interested in the question) and why you think the work is important.

There will be meetings with search committee members, the faculty who organizes teaching, faculty in the area, graduate students, Diversity Steering Committee members, faculty of color and women faculty in our department, and our department chair and or dean. Once we get your dates selected, we'll begin scheduling and will send you your schedules a few days before your interview.

We'll also have a casual "coffee hour" with faculty in which we talk informally about living in [location], our experiences with the department, etc.

There are other people or groups you can meet with as well if you'd like to, such as faculty in other areas of our department, faculty in other departments, and/or junior faculty in our department. You are also always welcome to meet with any of them in the days/weeks after the interview. If you'd like any of these (or any other meetings) as part of your interview days, please feel free to let me know.

Accommodations

If any of the above seems challenging or less than ideal for you for any reason or if you run into questions at any point, please do not hesitate to let me or one of the people who will be helping with scheduling and coordination ([names of staff members]) know. They are cc-ed on this email. We are aiming to make the interview process as useful and fun as possible and can be flexible. We would love your input on any of the above or anything else!

Mentorship Checks

General Principles

- Several of our searches found it helpful to perform “mentorship checks” with late-stage candidates.
- Mentorship checks involve reaching out to a person or people the candidate has mentored and asking questions to reveal any red flags or pertinent information about their mentoring style.
- The primary goal of mentorship checks is to reduce the likelihood of hiring someone with an established pattern of toxic or abusive mentoring.

Process

- Mentorship checks can occur after interviews as a final check or earlier in the process to help narrow down the pool.
- Someone on the search committee may email the candidate with a request for a mentee’s contact information (see below for example message), and/or the search committee may use previously established relationships to contact people they know have worked with the candidate.
- Mentorship checks can consist of an email or phone exchange with the mentee, but consider that mentees may feel safer to speak freely on a call than in writing.
- Discuss with your committee what sort of mentee would be most helpful to contact.

Things to consider:

- A “lower power” mentee may have observations that a “higher power” mentee would not (e.g., one of our searches sought out undergraduate, lab staff member, or junior graduate student mentees).
- A current mentee may feel that the stakes are higher for offering negative feedback than a past mentee (e.g., one of our searches sought out people that had been, but were no longer, mentored by the candidate).
- Feel free to seek out mentees of multiple sorts (e.g., current; prior; different career levels) to get a variety of perspectives on the candidate, especially if you are conducting mentorship checks at the final stage of candidate selection.

Example Message to Candidate to Solicit Mentee Contacts

EXAMPLE

Hi [CANDIDATE],

We haven’t made a decision yet, but we are happy to let you know that you are in our top three candidates. As part of our search, we are doing “mentorship” checks on all our top

candidates. Would you mind sending me the contact info for an RA, lab manager, or more junior graduate student you have mentored in research? I'd like to speak to them for about 10 minutes and ask a few questions.

Thank you!

[SEARCH COMMITTEE CHAIR]

Example Questions for Mentees

- What is your relationship with <candidate>?
- How would you describe <candidate>'s mentoring style?
- How would you describe <candidate>'s interpersonal style?
- All mentors have things they need to work on. What do you think <candidate> needs to work on with respect to mentoring?
- What are your experiences with voicing concerns or disagreements, either in class or on research, with <candidate>?
- How frequently did you feel like your ideas showed up in your studies and projects?
- To your knowledge, have any students broken off their relationship with <candidate> in terms of switching to a different advisor? If so, how many and why?

Next Steps

General Principles

- Continue the practice of being transparent and promptly communicative with candidates regarding timeline and decisions.
- Consider taking a few minutes at the end of the final round interviews to touch base with candidates on their interview/visit experience.
- Gather feedback from everyone in the department who attended or participated in the final round of interviews, job talks, etc.
 - Prepare department members in advance to give productive, equitable feedback by communicating clear expectations and educating about bias
- Report back to department on search progress and how decisions were made.

Candidate Debriefs

Hosting candidate debriefs can be beneficial for culture searches (i.e., candidates who went well and what made them what they liked and didn't like during the interview process). Debriefs can be structured or can simply consist of a casual conversation with a committee chair or contact person at the end of the day. Candidates may vary in levels of openness expressing their feedback while review and evaluation is still ongoing, but a brief check-in at the end of the final round of interviews can still produce helpful insights.

- For example, the observation from one of our searches that women candidates re-recorded their job talks many times while men did not came from a casual conversation at the end of the interview day.

Feedback Gathered from Department

One crucial follow-up to the interview process is to gather insights and feedback on candidates from those outside the search committee who interacted with them. In our searches, all faculty and graduate students in the department were eligible to respond.

Bias in Department Evaluations

One primary risk of asking for feedback from department members who have been less involved in the search process is the risk of introducing additional bias into the evaluative process. Department members outside the search committee may not have thought as deeply about creating an equitable search. Here are some principles to keep in mind as you seek to balance giving all department members a voice with reducing the impact of bias:

- **Train** ahead of time. Consider holding a forum as early as possible (ideally prior to the start of the search process) in which department members discuss potential issues and

the history of bias in the department's hiring to preemptively mitigate biases and increase introspection. Train department members to look for behavioral evidence of candidates' characteristics, to avoid judgments about a candidate's personality or likeability, and to understand how the search committee is defining and assessing collegiality. Evidence-based faculty recruitment workshops can be effective in motivating faculty to participate in equitable practices¹⁴.

- **Include** graduate students in bias training. Often faculty members are targeted for education on bias because of their greater power in the department, but all department members who will be providing feedback on candidates should be part of efforts to mitigate evaluation bias.
- **Structure** all interviews (including graduate student interviews) with standardized, pre-approved questions (see "[First-Round Interviews](#)" and "[Final Round Interviews](#)" for details and question examples.)
- **Examine** department members' evaluations once you receive their survey responses:
 - Are there more positive comments for men and White candidates? Are there more negative comments for women and BIPOC?¹⁵
 - Do department members comment on candidates' personalities and likeability?¹⁶ Watch for the emergence of stereotypes (e.g., characterizing Black women as intimidating, aggressive, or unapproachable)¹⁷
 - Look for bias both at the individual and group levels. Even if no strong biases emerge among individuals, group-level patterns may reveal tendencies to evaluate members of some groups more harshly than others.
 - Discuss with your committee which department member observations are fair and which should be set aside or approached with caution in the evaluation process.
 - In addition to race and gender stereotypes, it's important to be on the lookout for other types of bias (e.g., bias against "non-traditional" career paths; see page 16 of the [UW Handbook](#)).

Example of Department Survey

EXAMPLE

¹⁴Sekaquaptewa et al., 2019

¹⁵Rudman & Phelan, 2008; Quillian et al., 2020

¹⁶Lao et al., 1975; Rudman & Glick, 2002

¹⁷Malveaux, 1989; Devine, 1989

<Respondent asked to provide their name>

You only need to address the questions that you feel you have sufficient information to answer. The search committee thanks you for putting in the time to help with this search process!

<Respondent asked to check off which meetings they attended>

- Attended main talk
- Attended paper meeting
- Small group interview
- One-on-one meeting
- Reviewed CV
- Read published/unpublished work
- Member of [department area that is hiring]

Main Questions:

- To what degree is this someone you would like to see as a faculty member in our department?
- Diversity: Please comment on how this candidate shows evidence of the following: leadership in diversity initiatives, diversity in research perspectives or populations, and/or ability to serve as a role model to underrepresented minorities in the department.
- Quality and contribution of science: Please share your opinion on this candidate's potential for generating high quality information and insights that are valuable both in and beyond the field of <field>, using appropriate and innovative methods and practices.
- Broad Thinking: Please comment on the candidate's ability to think broadly about the implications of their work, express thinking beyond concrete goals of projects, bridge their work to other areas and fields, and consider minoritized populations in their research.
- Research Focus: Please comment on how well this candidate's research fits with the focus on causes and consequences of social inequities and how to remedy them (e.g., issues of diversity, intergroup and interracial relations, prejudice, stereotypes, culture, racial and ethnic identity, racism, institutional and systemic bias, and social groups, broadly construed).

- Teaching: Please assess this candidate's potential for high quality and inclusive teaching and mentorship of students, including potential to recruit and mentor underrepresented minorities and students whose work centers diverse populations.
- Interdisciplinary: Please comment on how this candidate complements the priority areas of the departmental mission: promote social equity, optimize human potential, and understand mind through behavior and brain science. Potential evidence of cross disciplinary interests (background, training, scholarship, teaching).
- Service/collegiality: Please indicate your opinion of this candidate's willingness to work with others in the department, being a collegial and collaborative team player.
- Is there any other information that you feel the committee should know about this candidate?

Search Committee Decision-Making and Offers

The “above threshold” method can be applied to broader decision-making as well as specific rubric criteria. Our search committee chairs found success in approaching final decision-making from the perspective of first deciding who was above threshold for the position and then focusing on the optimal order to make offers (e.g., “all of our final candidates are above threshold -- which candidate best fits the needs and considerations of the department?”) rather than trying to identify the “lone superstar” among the final candidates. This mindset may also help increase buy-in from the broader department by making it clear that at this stage there are no bad choices.

Rejections

Decide who will be the point of contact for reaching out to candidates who did not get the first offer or who are queued as alternates. These messages could come from the search committee chair or the Department Chair. Email rejections may be appropriate earlier in the selection process; below is an example of an email rejection prior to interviews.

Example of Rejection Message (Early-Stage)

EXAMPLE

Subject: UW Psych of Inequity search

Dear applicant to the UW Psychology of Inequity faculty job,

Thank you very much for your application to our search. We appreciate the time and effort that you spent applying to our position. We received many stellar applications this year, and unfortunately your application was not selected to move forward to our interview stage this year.

Thank you for your interest in our position and in UW. We hope to have other similar positions in the coming years, and we hope that you'll consider applying again to other positions at UW in the future.

Best,
Search Committee (MEMBER NAMES)

Reporting Back to Department

Transparency and clear communication should apply not only to interactions with candidates but also to information sharing within the department. Consider how you can update and give insight into your hiring process to (a) department faculty; and (b) everyone who was involved in the search process, including students and staff. Below we briefly discuss two methods for reporting back to department stakeholders that can be implemented in tandem: open update meetings and search reports.

Update Meetings

Holding brief, remote or in-person meetings open to anyone who would like to attend (e.g., grad students) with updates on the search can be a powerful way of establishing transparency and open communication and increasing buy-in throughout the department. Recommendations below:

- Hold an update meeting before candidates come to interview. Explain the committee's criteria, procedures, and how the search has been conducted so far. If possible, include details on the practices the search has followed to increase equity.

- This is also an opportunity to review how interviews will work and why it is important that we follow certain procedures (e.g., standardized interview questions.)
- Once the committee has made its recommendation for candidate selection, hold a meeting to report on who the committee is recommending at the same time or very soon after the news is released to faculty.
- Consider these meetings not only a communication tool but also a training opportunity for graduate students and other department stakeholders who may be involved in future faculty searches.

Recommendation Reports

Recommendation reports to department faculty represent a more formal method of communication that occurs once search committees have arrived at their final recommendation for the order in which offers should be extended to candidates. Below are some key recommendations for ensuring that these reports continue to prioritize equity and transparency:

- Summarize the baseline requirements for the position (e.g., core topics of research and training)
- For each round of review, explain (a) the criteria upon which candidates were scored; (b) the scoring scheme (e.g., 1-4); and (c) how many candidates advanced to the next round of review.
- Provide the basic structure of interviews, including length, who they interviewed with, and any equitable interview practices that were utilized (e.g., standardized questions provided to candidates in advance).
- Note any other activities from the final round that were considered in evaluation (e.g., job talks, paper Q&A meetings, etc.)
- Note any feedback that was collected from department members outside the search committee, such as surveys disseminated to interested faculty and graduate students.
- Our reports included a separate section with feedback on the recommendation provided by the Diversity Advisory Committee (DAC), in which we detailed any DEI training and resources the search committee received, how the search committee received consultation from the DAC on search materials (e.g., job ad, rubric), and the DAC's official endorsement of the committee's recommendations from a DEI perspective.
- Include a summary of the recommended candidate(s)' training, research, contributions to DEI, quality of work, funding history, teaching and mentoring, and any other components that may be of interest to the department.

Other Resources

The [UW Handbook of Best Practices for Faculty Searches](#) is a manual for broad practices in faculty hiring and retention and is essential reading for anyone involved in faculty searches. The UW Handbook addresses topics contained in this case study in more detail and additionally includes topics not addressed here, such as multi-year planning, cluster hires, faculty mentoring, and legal considerations.

The [UW Handbook online toolkit](#) accompanies the Handbook and offers additional resources and examples of materials across multiple academic units.

[UW ADVANCE Center for Institutional Change](#)

The [Spring 2021 Faculty Hiring Webinar](#) is a recording of a seminar given by Joyce Yen (Director of ADVANCE) and Chadwick Allen (Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement) on best practices in faculty hiring in a virtual environment.

[“Interrupting Bias in the Faculty Search Search Process”](#) (film and facilitation guide)

More on how virtual hiring has benefits for equity: [Faculty Hiring in a Virtual Environment: The Job Season Without In-Person Interviews](#)

References

- Andersen, J. P., Nielsen, M. W., Simone, N. L., Lewiss, R. E., & Jagsi, R. (2020). Meta-research: COVID-19 medical papers have fewer women first authors than expected. *eLife*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.58807>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *u. Chi. Legal f.*, 139.
- Derous, E., Buijsrogge, A., Roulin, N., & Duyck, W. (2016). Why your stigma isn't hired: A dual-process framework of interview bias. *Human Resource Management Review*, 26(2), 90-111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2015.09.006>
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 5–18. doi:10.1037=0022-3514.56.1.5
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573-598. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295X.109.3.573>
- Gaucher, D., Friesen, J., & Kay, A. C. (2011). Evidence that gendered wording in job advertisements exists and sustains gender inequality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(1), 109-128. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022530>
- Guarino, C. M. & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education*, 58(6), 672-694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2>
- Ibarra, H., & Obodaru, O. (2009, January). Women and the vision thing. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2009/01/women-and-the-vision-thing>
- King, M. M., & Frederickson, M. E. (2021). The pandemic penalty: The gendered effects of COVID-19 on scientific productivity. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 7. 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23780231211006977>
- Kim, H. S. (2002). We talk, therefore we think? A cultural analysis of the effect of talking on thinking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 828–842. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.4.828>
- Lao, R. C., Upchurch, W. H., Corwin, B. J., & Grossnickle, W. F. (1975). Biased attitudes toward females as indicated by ratings of intelligence and likeability. *Psychological Reports*, 37(3_suppl), 1315-1320. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1975.37.3f.1315>
- Malveaux, J. (1989). Angry. *Essence*, 20(1): 64.
- Miller, C., & Roksa, J. (2020). Balancing research and service in academia: Gender, race, and laboratory tasks. *Gender and Society*, 34(1), 131-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243219867917>
- Sekaquaptewa, D., Takahashi, K., Malley, J., Herzog, K., & Bliss, S. (2019). An evidence-based faculty recruitment workshop influences departmental hiring practice perceptions among university faculty. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-11-2018-0215>
- Staniscuaski, F., Kmetzsch, L., Soletti, R. C., Reichert, F., Zandonà, E., Ludwig, Z., Lima, E. F., Neumann, A., Schwartz, I., Mello-Carpes, P. B., Tamajusuku, A., Werneck, F. P., Ricachenevsky, F. K., Infanger, C., Seixas, A., Staats, C. C., & de Oliveira, L. (2021).

Gender, race and parenthood impact academic productivity during the COVID-19 pandemic: From survey to action. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 663252.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.663252>

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, 52(6), 613–629. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.6.613>

Quillian, L., Lee, J. J., Oliver, M. (2020). Evidence from field experiments in hiring shows substantial additional racial discrimination after the callback. *Social Forces*, 99(2), 732–759. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soaa026>

Appendix

A. UW Psychology Faculty Searches by the Numbers

General:

- All of the candidates we made offers to in all areas (across 3 searches) accepted
- 5 total new faculty members (Inequity-- 2; MMM -- 1 + 1 partner; IDS -- 1)
- All BIPOC, 4/5 URM, 3/5 women

Psychology of Inequity search:

- 143 total candidates
- Phone interviews, then fourth cut: final pool reduced to 5 candidates (1 faculty, 2 postdocs, 2 grad students; 3 women, 2 men; all URM)
- Offers made to & accepted by 2 candidates (both URM, one man one woman)

Molecular Mechanisms of the Mind search:

- 165 total candidates
- Final pool of 5 candidates (5 BIPOC, 2/5 URM, 2/5 women)
- Offer made to 1 candidate (man, URM); 1 spousal accommodation (woman, BIPOC)

Integrative Developmental Science search:

- 203 total candidates
- Final pool: 4 candidates (3 women, 1 man; 3 BIPOC, 1 URM)
- Offer made to 1 candidate (woman, URM)

B. Timeline Overview

The entire hiring process, from finalizing the advertisement to finishing candidate interviews, lasted between 24-32 weeks (not counting academic breaks).

Submission of Hiring Advert to Administration

Submission of Hiring Ad and rubrics.

Solicitation of Applications and Initial Evaluation

Application review date: ~8 weeks after job posting

Applications will require: separate statements of research, teaching, and diversity; CV, and no more than two reprints or preprints, three names of references to be contacted later (see [“Application Package”](#)).

Creation of Long List (1-2 weeks after application review date)

An initial rubric based on research quality, training background, methods, and fit, as well as diversity and first-authored publications will be used during the first round of applicant evaluations. This will result in a long list, consisting of no more than 50% of the initial applications. Letters of recommendation will be required upon request (during the second round of application reviews to help determine medium-short list).

Creation of 8-10 Medium List (3-4 weeks later)

During the second round of applicant evaluations, the search committee will create a medium list of potential candidates (8-10 candidates) based on their evaluations using the rubric (with a more keen eye towards specific research overlap and fit) plus letters of recommendation and consideration of interdisciplinarity, teaching/mentoring, and service/collegiality.

Interviews for the Phone list candidates (1-2 weeks)

The phone list of 8-10 candidates will be interviewed by the search committee via phone (or camera-off Zoom) using a set list of questions (based on final rubric) to be asked of all interviewed candidates. Phone interviews will be conducted by the entire search committee and questions will be given to candidates in advance. In Natural Sciences, the divisional dean reviews and approves this list with the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement.

Calls to letter writers (1-2 week)

Solicit letters from references (if choosing not to request letters until after the cut to medium list.)

Formation of a short list of 4-5 candidates (1-2 week later)

A rubric based on quality of science, teaching/mentoring, and diversity, phone interview, and letter writer calls, will be used during the third round of applicant evaluations. This will result in a short list. The search committee will send this list of final candidates to whatever approval process exists in their department and then to the dean for approval.

Interviews for the short list candidates (2 weeks later; 2-3 weeks of interviews on campus)

Interviewing the top candidates in person or via Zoom. Short list candidates will be invited to give a department seminar talk (one paper talk/chalk talk/discussion/teaching talk, one job talk) and then interview with the department faculty, graduate students and postdocs, assistant professors, faculty of Color and women faculty, the department chair, and the department diversity committee, and divisional dean.